INTER-PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

IN THE PLAYS OF

HENRIK IBSEN AND

ARTHUR WING PINERO

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfilment

of the requirements for the Degree

of

Master of Arts in English

in the

University of Canterbury

by

N. E. Peters

University of Canterbury

1987

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

Henrik Ibsen is widely accepted as being one of the most important influences on the Modern Drama, while Arthur Wing Pinero, the most successful English playwright of the 1880's, has been almost forgotten. Ibsen criticism has become repetitive, while criticism of Pinero's work is both superficial and sporadic. There is no comparative study of Ibsen with the English dramatists of the 1880's.

The study of Inter-personal Relationships in the plays of Ibsen and Pinero not only provides further insight into the work of each, but also a starting point for just such a comparison.

Part One involves a close textual analysis. For the purposes of this study, Inter-personal Relationships are divided into four main types: Familial, Inter-sexual, Friendship and Inter-class. Part One concludes that Convergence, the mutual union of individuals, predominates in Pinero, while Divergence is paramount in Ibsen.

Part Two considers possible reasons for this dichotomy. Chapter Five focuses upon Human Nature as it is established in the plays. Chapter Six concentrates upon the dramatists' respective attitudes toward the Collective, the union of persons on the basis of common belief or purpose, and the Individual as apparent in the plays.

The study of Inter-personal Relationships reveals the Ideals central to the work of each dramatist - Love in Pinero versus Truth and Freedom in Ibsen.

REFERENCES

All references to the plays are to the following editions:

A: IBSEN

McFarlane, James Walter, (tr. and ed.), The Oxford Ibsen. 8 vols, London: Oxford University Press, 1960-1977.

Vol 5: Pillars of Society, A Doll's House, Ghosts.

Vol 6: An Enemy of the People, The Wild Duck, Rosmersholm.

Vol 7: The Lady from the Sea, Hedda Gabler, The Master Builder.

B: PINERO

The Squire London: Samuel French Ltd., 1905.

The Rocket London: Samuel French Ltd., 1905.

In Chancery London: Samuel French Ltd., 1905.

The Magistrate London: Samuel French Ltd., 1892.

The Schoolmistress Boston: W.H. Baker and Coy., 1894.

The Hobby Horse London: William Heinemann, 1892.

Dandy Dick London: William Heinemann, 1893.

Sweet Lavender London: William Heinemann, 1893.

The Weaker Sex London: William Heinemann, 1909.

The Cabinet Minister London: William Heinemann, 1892.

The Profligate New York: United States Book Coy., 1891.

INTRODUCTION

This thesis stems from a personal belief that such a comparison is long overdue: while there is a proliferation of critical writing, in English, which focuses upon the idiosyncracy of Ibsen's drama, there is no specific comparison between Ibsen and his English contemporaries.[1] Similarly, existing Ibsen criticism is concentrated in traditional and, therefore, limited areas.
Pinero, heralded as "Father to the Modern English Comedy of Wilde, Maugham and Coward",[2] and reputed to have produced, "one of the only two original Art forms England can claim to have evolved during the Nineteenth Century,"[3] has also been called "one of the most neglected of the major English dramatists".[4] Critically, Pinero's work has been largely ignored from the time of his death, until the present day, while existing studies tend to dismiss his earlier work, focussing instead upon the later years.[5]

Ibsen and Pinero are well-suited to comparison. Not only were they writing at the same time, for much of their careers, but they were both major figures in the drama of the day. Ibsen's immediate notoriety and largely posthumous success are widely accepted. Less well known is the fact that by 1889, Pinero was pre-eminent in London, where his work predominated in the commercial theatres.[6] Pinero's play, The Magistrate (1885), established a new record for continuous London performances, which remained

unbeaten until his play Sweet Lavender (1888) ran for 683 performances.[7]
Along with the plays of Ibsen, certain of Pinero's plays have captured a place in the modern Repertoire.[8]

The aim of this thesis is two-fold: firstly, to extend the area of critical concern relating to both Ibsen and Pinero, by focussing upon Interpersonal Relationships. Secondly, this thesis aims to establish an alternative basis of comparison for the work of Ibsen, with other dramatists, beginning with an important English contemporary.
In the pursuit of these aims, it is hoped that a greater understanding, and appreciation, of the work of both dramatists is fostered.

The intention to focus almost exclusively upon the plays themselves, ignoring extraneous details as concern the biography of the dramatist, or the stage history of a particular play, for example, is deliberate. This is the result of personal preference, and is a reaction against a tendency within modern dramatic criticism to approach a work extrinsically, often to the extent that the work purportedly under study becomes secondary.

This thesis is divided into two parts. Part One consists of a detailed analysis of Interpersonal Relationships in the plays of Ibsen and Pinero.
Interpersonal relationships, for the purpose of analysis, can be classified according to four main types; familial, inter-sexual, friendship and inter-class relations.

Interpersonal relations in the plays of Ibsen demonstrate the principle of DIVERGENCE, while in the plays

of Pinero, the practice and spirit of CONVERGENCE predominates.

Convergence is understood as the mutual union of individuals. The interpersonal relationship which is the result of such convergence can be either legally or religiously constituted, as in familial or matrimonial relations, or mutually acknowledged, as in friendship, courtship and employer-employee relations.

Divergence can mean the weakening or even repudiation of existing relationships, or, alternatively, be used to refer to the static situation in which individuals exist outside of a satisfying and fulfilling interpersonal relationship.

Part Two examines Human Nature as evident from an analysis of character in the plays, before moving on to the playwright's individual perceptions of interpersonal relations, as understood from a study of the 'Collective' as opposed to the 'Individual" in their plays.[9]

Human Nature in Ibsen is determined by the desire for self-gratification; socially, materially, and in terms of power, or happiness. As a consequence, characters tend to be both unwilling and unable to either form or maintain a stable relationship.

Conversely, in Pinero, Human Nature is both selfless and selfsacrificing, kind, loving and forgiving, and therefore genuinely concerned for the welfare, security and happiness of others. Convergence can be seen as a natural by-product of such tendencies.

The Collective is understood as the union of persons, and can be established on the basis of common ideology, belief and purpose, or, as the product of regional and

class distinctions, for example. Collectives include local bureaucracy and political parties; institutions such as the Church, the Law, the Press; and Society, being all-inclusive. Interpersonal relations can be seen as simply a Collective in the personal sense, incorporating family, friends or acquaintances; and consequently, to mirror the paradigm established for the Collective in the plays.

The Individual is one alienated from the Collective in terms of behaviour and belief.

In Ibsen, the Collective is associated with coercion and repression, hypocrisy, deceit, degeneracy and compromise. The Individual, in Ibsen, is not only a viable social entity, but also an ideal.

Conversely, in Pinero, the Collective is associated with harmony, stability, security and order. Individuality in Pinero is synonymous with alienation and loneliness, the result of either anti-social behaviour or misfortune, and therefore an unenviable position.

This study focuses upon the period approximating the decade 1880-1890, as one in which both Ibsen and Pinero were writing prolifically.[10]

CHAPTER ONE

FAMILIAL RELATIONSHIPS

Divergence, in the sense of both the static situation as well as the nature of relations, is a familial trait in Ibsen. This is true whatever the status of a family within a play - central, minor, or offstage.

In Pillars of Society, static divergence can be seen in the fact that Dina Dorf is believed to be an orphan who may alternately have illegitimate status. Step-relations are established as existing between Betty and Lona, and, therefore, Lona and Johan; also Martha, Lona, Johan and Hilmar, each unmarried, do not appear fully integrated into any familial unit. The parents of Betty, Lona, Johan, Hilmar, Bernick and Martha are apparently deceased.
Divergence is evident in the relations between parent and child, siblings, as well as the more tenuous relationships. Dina Dorf is possibly the illegitimate daughter of Consul Bernick and yet this is not acknowledged by Bernick either publicly, or to Dina. Nor does Bernick appear to have established a surrogate paternal relationship with her.[1] He does call Dina a "Flighty little hussy!" (page 49).
The antagonism between Bernick and his son Olaf is manifested in Bernick's chastisement of Olaf for apparently running away, and Olaf's consequent resolution to do so, which he adheres to later in the play. Bernick reiterates

the value his son has for him, as his heir, "It doesn't suit my book at all to be left childless..." (page 79).
Betty and her step-sister Lona are said in Act One to have "broken off all connection," (page 34). It appears likely that Bernick misappropriated his sister Martha's share of the family fortune. Following Bernick's takeover of the family concern, "Martha was left pretty well high and dry," (page 66).
Referring to his wife's step-sister Lona and brother Johan, Bernick claims, "What a blight it is, having people like that in the family!" (page 50). Hilmar calls his cousin Betty's son, "Blockhead" and "stupid!" (page 29).

That physical convergence can be distinguished from convergent familial relations is evident with the return of Lona and Johan from the United States, and fifteen years estranged from the Bernick family. Johan comments upon Betty's welcome, "she didn't exactly receive me like a loving sister" (page 91). Betty expresses to Lona as well as her belief that her step-sister hates her, her own resentment at having suffered public notoriety because of Lona's past actions (page 71).
Bernick threatens to denounce Johan publicly, (page 91), and also allows his brother-in-law to travel on a ship which Bernick knows to be unseaworthy.
Hilmar ignores his step-cousin Lona in the street and asserts of Johan, "It's absolutely intolerable, the way some people manage to survive" (page 57).

Pillars of Society appears to close upon a convergent family scene:

> Oh, come closer...all round me. Come along, Betty! Come along, Olaf, my boy. And you, Martha...it seems as though I hadn't seen you all these years. (page 126)

As well, Betty, Lona and Bernick agree to "set up home together" (page 126).

It is doubtful whether familial convergence in effect exists. A physical gulf still separates Johan and Dina, who chose to exile themselves from the rest of the family, in the United States. Before leaving, Johan had threatened Bernick that he would, "Get my own back on the whole lot of you" (page 99).

The reconciliation between Lona and Betty appears contrived, given the vehemence of Betty's previous antipathy toward, and, mistrust of, Lona.

Acceptance of familial convergence largely depends upon a belief in an apparent character change in Bernick, from a selfish, manipulative person to a sincere, family man. That Bernick is truly repentant for his past misdemeanours, is undermined by the fact that such confessions win him not only familial support, but public favour.

In A Doll's House, Torvald's relationship with his children is characterized by physical alienation, evident as they appear in the same room on only one occasion. As the children return in Act One, Torvald asserts, "The place now becomes unbearable for anybody except mothers" and promptly leaves (page 222). As Nora surmises that the children can be expected to enjoy Christmas, Torvald interrupts, musing upon his assured "safe job" and "fat income" (page 206).

Nora's relationship with her children appears convergent, as is

evident in the pleasure she gains from buying them presents (page 203) and playing with them (page 223). This seemingly positive relationship is undermined when Nora recognizes the true nature of her feelings, "at home I was Daddy's doll child. And the children in turn have been my dolls" (page 274). That her children are essentially her playthings is reinforced by the terms which she uses to refer to them, "my pretty little dollies," "my sweet little baby doll" (page 222).[2]

Divergence in the Helmer family is actualized as Nora departs, having renounced her role as wife and mother. In the alternative ending to A Doll's House Nora agrees to remain with her family, her maternal instincts apparently awakened by a final look at her children. However, to what extent can a family be described as convergent when the wife and mother believes her continued presence to be "a sin against myself" (page 288) as Nora does?

Familial convergence is further undermined by Nora's change of character in the course of the play. It is unlikely that Nora will be able to regress to the point where she can be happy in a family situation, as she believed she was in the play's opening. In the alternative ending to the play, it is possible to distinguish between interpersonal convergence and the mere physical convergence of individuals, which is, in effect, all that the modified ending provides for.

Minor families in the play demonstrate divergence, in the sense of both the static familial situation as well as familial relations. Mrs. Linde is characterized as having been widowed for three years and having no children (page 208). Krogstad is also widowed and acts as a single parent to his children. Familial life for Rank appears to have been unhappy:

> His father was a horrible man, who used to have mistresses and things like that. That's why the son was always ailing, right from being a child. (page 237)

In the present, Rank appears to have no family. Anne-Marie, formerly Nora's Nanny, who was, and still is, unmarried, had an illegitimate daughter which she gave to "strangers" (page 236) to raise.

The union of Krogstad and his children with Mrs. Linde does not counteract the numerous instances of familial divergence in the play. Mrs. Linde and Krogstad have united out of a mutual need, "I need someone to mother, and your children need a mother" (page 265). Can familial convergence develop upon such a basis? Rank's omen, supported by examples of family life in the play, suggests that instances of familial convergence can only be transitory. Referring to his own afflictions Rank states:

> Somewhere, somehow, every single family must be suffering some such cruel retribution.... (page 245)

In Ghosts, the long period of physical separation between Oswald and his parents, beginning when he was aged seven, is openly acknowledged. That this divergence has penetrated to the core of the parent-child relationship is only progressively revealed. Oswald begins by expressing joy at being reunited with his mother:

> Think what it means to me...to be home, to sit at my mother's own table, in my mother's room.... (page 393) [3]

The convergent atmosphere of the reunion is undermined initially by Owald's reiteration of his dissatisfaction with the weather,[4] which then develops into his expressions of dissatisfaction with the family home:

> how dark it is here!...All the times
> I've been home, I can't ever remember
> having once seen the sun. (page 398)

Oswald shortly after reveals his doubts concerning the degree of his mother's love for him, "does it really make you so very happy to have me home?" (page 393). Oswald's recollections of the childhood years he spent at home with his family are unhappy. Referring to his father, he recalls:

> 'Smoke lad,' he said,...And I smoked
> as hard as I could, till I felt I was
> going quite pale and great beads of
> sweat stood out on my forehead. Then
> he roared with laughter...Then I was
> sick, and I saw you were crying. (page 367)

It is Oswald himself who exposes the extent to which the parents are strangers to their child, and the fact that familial convergence has been unable to develop on such a foundation, "I never knew anything about my father" (pages 415-16). That a son should love his father in spite of all Oswald rejects as "this old superstititon" (page 416). Referring to his mother, Oswald states, "I...know that you are fond of me. And that's something I must be grateful to you for" (page 416). This divergence is actualized in Oswald's rejection of his mother in favour of Regine.[5]

Near the end of the play, the Maternal impulse is potentially subordinated to the Rational, as Mrs. Alving is forced to choose between preserving her son's life and aiding him in his death. The audience cannot be sure which tendency will predominate.

The divergence which is central to the Engstrand's familial relationship is immediately obvious to the audience. The Engstrand can be seen as a foil to the Alving in the play, accentuating the divergent tendencies common to both

families.

Divergence is evident in the expressions of mutual dislike by Regine and Engstrand. Regine tells her father "Stop clamping about with that foot" (page 349) and adds, "I don't want anything to do with you" (page 354). With regard to Engstrand, Regine recalls "all the times you've sworn at me" and "Often enough you've said I wasn't any concern of yours" (page 351).

When Regine and Engstrand do emphasize their relationship this is for mercenary reasons. Engstrand expresses paternal concern for Regine in an attempt to persuade her to prostitute herself in his proposed 'Seamen's Home'. Engstrand claims that he wants her to live with him so that he can offer her "a father's hand to guide you" (page 353). Similarly, Engstrand attempts to persuade Manders of his affection for Regine to redeem his character in Manders' eyes, "take good care of Regine for me. *He wipes away a tear*... ah,...it's just as though she were tied fast to my heart strings" (page 391).

Divergence between father and daughter is actualized in Ghosts when the grounds for their relationship are shown to be fallacious, as Regine is revealed to be Alving's daughter. Regine expresses loyalty and affection for her mother as she defends her to Engstrand, "You say one word about Mother, and I'll let you have it " (page 354). The vulnerability of the mother-daughter relationship is demonstrated in the divergence resulting as Regine learns of her mother's affair with Captain Alving, "So my mother was that sort" (page 413).

Divergence is evident in the only sibling relationship in the play. Regine's decision to leave the Alvings is

unchanged by the knowledge that Oswald is her half-brother:

> you don't catch me staying out here in the country, working myself to death looking after invalids. (page 411)

The sibling relationship between Thomas and Peter in An Enemy of the People appears subordinated to their respective civic positions: Thomas, as medical officer, has discovered that the Public Baths are a health hazard and is determined to rectify the situation. Peter, as Mayor, for financial reasons, as well as to preserve his own public reputation, is opposed to any additional work on the Baths. A closer examination of the play reveals the extent to which the issue of the Baths is merely a catalyst for blatant sibling rivalry - the extent to which antagonism on a public level can be seen as determined by the nature of their personal relations.

Peter's relationship with Thomas in Act One is presented in terms of his petty attacks upon his brother's lifestyle. Peter criticises Thomas for eating a cooked meal in the evening and taking a walk after supper (page 24). Such attacks develop to reveal a deeper level of animosity in the form of Peter's apparent jealousy of his brother. Referring to rumours which suggest that Thomas initiated the development of the Baths, Peter disagrees, "Yes, this isn't the first time I've heard of people getting that idea" (page 26). Peter's immediate reaction to Thomas' report on the Baths is to react not to the content but to the fact that it was instigated without his knowledge, "Was it necessary to make all these investigations behind my back?" (page 53). Reacting to the findings, Peter asserts, "The only thing that's clear in my opinion is that you are trying to pick a quarrel

again" (page 58). Peter is unable to accept that Thomas' motives can be benign, instead believing his brother to be acting in league with Kiil, "These violent, ruthless attacks...Just your part of the bargain for being included in that vindictive old man's will" (page 115). Peter's final speech to Thomas fuses both public and personal antagonism:

> Things are finished now between us.
> Your dismissal is final...for now we
> have a weapon against you. (page 115)

It would appear that for Thomas also, the nature of the contest takes precedence over the issues involved. As he tells his brother, "I shall prove that I'm right and you're wrong" (page 60). At the public meeting, Thomas refers to "my magnificent brother Peter...so terribly lacking in natural distinction" (page 100).
Thomas and Peter mutually terminate their relationship at the end of the play.

A parent-child relationship exists between Morten Kiil and Thomas' wife, Katherine. For Morten, the pursuit of self-interest assumes greater value than amicable familial relations. Morten asserts, "My good name means a lot to me...I want to live and die with my reputation clear" (page 117). Regarding the polluted state of his tannery, Morten attempts to blackmail Thomas into silence, using the fate of Katherine's inheritance as the bait. Thomas asserts of Morten, "When I look at you, it's just like looking at the devil himself..." (page 118).

In the opening scene of The Wild Duck, Hjalmar refuses to publicly acknowledge his own father, establishing the tone of familial relations in the play.

This disavowal of the parent-child relationship comes as his father appears in the midst of Werle's dinner party, and Hjalmar turns his back on him (page 141). Asked if he knew the old man Hjalmar replies, "I don't know...I didn't notice" (page 141).

Hjalmar's selfishness and pride function as a barrier to convergence. Hjalmar perceives it to be "rather humiliating for a man like me to see his grey-haired father being treated like an outcast" (page 173). While he is obviously alienated from his father, Hjalmar presumes to judge the old man's actions nonetheless. Of Old Ekdal's attempt to commit suicide, Hjalmar concludes, "he didn't dare. He was a coward" (page 187).

Hjalmar's professed love for his daughter Hedvig[7] is presented as being at odds with his behaviour towards her, as he is shown to be repeatedly responsible for her unhappiness. Hjalmar fails to return with "nice things" (page 158) from the Werle's as he had promised Hedvig, so that she is left, "swallowing her tears" (page 159). Hjalmar attacks his daughter on an occasion when she approaches him as he feigns to be working, "What do you want to come sniffing round like this for?"(page 178). In a fit of anger later in the play, Hjalmar threatens to strangle the wild duck which is Hedvig's prized possession. Hjalmar's self-centredness, evident in his relationship with his father, is similarly evident with Hedvig, as he perceives her imminent loss of sight solely in terms of himself, "Oh, it's quite heart-breaking for me" (page 163).

The tenuousness of the Ekdal's familial relationship is further evident following the revelation in Act Four that Werle, and not Hjalmar, may be Hedvig's father. Familial

divergence is made concrete as Hjalmar turns firstly upon his wife, Gina, "I too used to think our home was a good place. What a mistake that was" (page 205), and then upon Hedvig "go away! I can't bear to look at you" (page 218). Hjalmar asserts "This house is no place for me anymore" (page 218) as he leaves, seemingly permanently.

Conversely, familial convergence appears assured in the final act as the family unit seems about to be re-established. Hjalmar returns and agrees to stay temporarily (page 233), giving the impression that he has returned for good, as he eats a meal prepared for him by his wife. Hjalmar demonstrates a desire to reaffirm the parent-child relationship with Hedvig, as he tells Gregers "I can't tell you how I loved that child" (page 235) and subsequently calls "Hedvig...Come to me!" (page 238). Such audience expectations are shattered when it is revealed that Hedvig is dead, thereby destroying the potential for the Ekdals to converge as a family. Pathos is generated as Hjalmar refuses to believe that she has died, "she'll be coming round soon" (page 239) and later "she *must* live!... just long enough for me to tell her how infinitely I loved her" (page 240).

However, not only is familial convergence thwarted, but the belief that the family could ever have converged is undermined. Hjalmar's self-centredness has been shown to have acted as a barrier in his relationships with Hedvig as well as his father. This tendency is similarly evident following Hedvig's death, *"He clenches his hands and cries to heaven* Oh God on high...Why hast Thou done this to me?" (page 240). Relling, in speaking to Gregers, questions the enduring quality, and therefore the reality, of Hjalmar's

love for Hedvig, "Give him nine months and little Hedvig will be nothing more than the theme of a pretty little party piece" (page 241).

The potentially sibling relationship between Hedvig and Gregers is shown to be a destructive force, as it is Gregers' advice to Hedvig for winning back her father that is indirectly responsible for her death. Gregers, aware that Hedvig may be his step-sister is reminiscent of Bernick with Dina, as neither demonstrates the desire or inclination to develop the potentially familial relationship.

The Werle family, previously consisting of Werle, his wife, and their son, Gregers, demonstrated unity only in the opposition of the wife/mother and son to the husband/father. As Werle recalls "The two of you were always pretty thick. She was the one who set you against me from the start" (page 146). With the death of the wife/mother, the antagonism between father and son is all that remains.

The reunion of Gregers and Werle is never more than physical. In their first discussion, Gregers challenges his father concerning the Ekdals (page 144). Further, Werle's idea of parent-child relations is shown to be selfish, "When two people are as closely connected as we are, one always has some use for the other, surely" (page 148). Gregers interprets this statement, and it appears rightly so, as the key to his father's motivation for inviting his son to return, given his imminent marriage to Mrs. Sorby "That's why I damn well had to turn up here... A bit of family life had to be organized" (page 149). Gregers and Werle each recognize their divergence. As Gregers leaves the family home Werle asserts, "The gulf between us is too wide", and Gregers agrees, "so I have

observed" (page 150). The polarity between father and son is further accentuated in their next meeting as Gregers reveals his life's work to be the exposure of his father's misdemeanours, requisite to opening Hjalmar's eyes (page 196). In Act Three, Gregers and Werle say their goodbyes, which appear irreversible.

The title of Ibsen's next play establishes it within the familial context. In Rosmersholm even tacit familial convergence is absent at the centre of the play. Rosmer is a widower as well, his marriage was childless. Rebecca West is an orphan, unmarried and without children. Divergence in terms of familial relations is a feature of the play. In the words of Kroll, "In a family there's always something or other that's not quite as it should be" (page 295).

It is suggested in the course of the play, that Rebecca may have illegitimate status as Doctor West was potentially her father (page 355-57). Rebecca's passionate unwillingness to believe that this is so, "It's impossible... It cannot be true! *she walks about wringing her hands*" (page 355), justifies a reinterpretation of the details of her past life - that she moved into Dr. West's house, took his name, and remained even though he allegedly treated her harshly. It would appear that Rebecca, unaware of her potential parent-child relationship with Dr. West, was the unwitting protagonist in an incestuous relationship.

Rosmer appears to sum up his relationship with his father in reference to his having driven Rosmer's tutor from the house, "*rather bitterly* Even at home Father was very much the major" (page 306).

Kroll reveals the nature of his family's relations to Rebecca:

> this spirit of defiance and revolt has intruded even into my own home...destroying the peace and quiet of my family life! (page 301)

Kroll's insensitivity to his now deceased sister Beata is suggested, "Straight over the footbridge for him. Even though it was his own sister" (page 294). Mrs. Kroll appears responsible, among others, for convincing her sister-in-law that an illicit relationship existed between Rebecca and Rosmer. Mrs. Helseth refers to "something not very nice that they had gone and got the poor, sick lady to believe" (page 346) concluding that those responsible were "wicked people" (page 346).

Hedda Gabler opens shortly after the establishment of a new family unit, consisting of Tesman and his new wife Hedda, as well as his surrogate parents, the two Aunts, Julle and Rina. In terms of interpersonal relations, the family fails to converge, largely due to the person of Hedda, who resists familial integration.

Hedda undermines the assumption that she is part of the family; as when Tesman refers to her as "belong(ing) to the (Tesman) family," and Hedda retorts "Hm...I'm not at all sure" (page 184). Hedda also resists Julle's attempts to establish a relationship with her new daughter-in-law, pulling away as the Aunt tries to kiss her "Oh...! Leave me be!" (page 182). Hedda appears malicious in the 'Hat' incident when she pretends to mistake Julle's hat for the maid's (page 183); and following the death of Rina, when she not only stresses that Julle will be lonely, but also implies that care of Rina must have been a burden (page 253).

Familial divergence is further evident in the extent to which Hedda distances herself from the Tesmans' concerns. Of the contest between Tesman and Lovborg for the professorship, Hedda asserts "that'll be Tesman's own affair. I'm not going to give it a thought" (page 213). Aware of their financial indebtedness to the Aunts, plus the potential that Tesman may not secure his professorship, Hedda is unwilling to curb her spending "This can't change anything so far as that's concerned" (page 200). Having refused to visit Rina when she was dying, Hedda demonstrates no grief at her death, "Well it was to be expected" (page 239). Hedda's unwillingness to integrate into the Tesman family may also explain her refusal to admit her pregnancy, as an additional bond between herself and the Tesmans.

The disintegration of the family appears tangibly with a succession of deaths: Aunt Rina firstly, and then Hedda, and consequently the child that she is carrying.

In terms of static divergence, Tesman is an orphan, who was raised by his two aunts, (page 175). Hedda, now also an orphan, was raised by her father following the death of her mother. Lovborg's experiences demonstrate the potential vulnerability of familial relations and the tenuousness of family feeling: "his relations...disowned him entirely" (page 199). Thea married and yet never fully integrated into her new family, as she refers to "my husband's (children). I haven't got any" (page 187). Unhappy, she leaves them all, lamenting to Hedda, "if only I had a home! But I haven't got one. Never had one" (page 190).

An analogy within the play establishes Ejlert's manuscript as the child resulting from the union of Ejlert and Thea. The familial divergence actualized in the course of the play means that the Lovborgs adhere to the paradigm for familial relations established in Ibsen. At the end of the play, the death of Ejlert, as 'husband-father' follows his renunciation of his connection with his 'family', "it's all over between us now" (page 246). A 'wife' without a husband and a 'child' without a father are all that remain.

In a Pinero play, familial divergence develops into convergence by means of a linear process. Once again, divergence is understood as referring to both the static situation as well as the nature of familial relations.

Divergence is evident in The Rocket in the form of the one parent family - Joslyn has a mother but no father, while Florence has a father but no mother. Also, John Mable is physically alienated from his daughter Florence, being ignorant as to her whereabouts.[8] Unfazed by his many disappointments, Mable has searched tirelessly for her. Divergence is evident in the relationship between Walkinshaw and Florence, who appears to be his daughter. Walkinshaw is called 'the Rocket' because when his daughter makes the wealthy match which he intends, Walkinshaw is determined to go up in the world. Of Florence's relationship with Joslyn, Walkinshaw lets slip "I always knew I should make money out of her, I mean..." (page 23).

Divergence is also evident in the nature of Florence's feelings for her 'father'. She comments to Joslyn upon his developing relationship with Joslyn's mother, "I wish Papa wouldn't be so silly" (page 44). In Act Two, Florence leaves London asserting of Joslyn, "You shall be free to teach my father the lesson he deserves" (page 49).
Between Joslyn and his mother divergence develops proportional to the development of Lady Hammersmith's infatuation with Walkinshaw. An altercation between the latter and Joslyn, precipitates Lady Hammersmith's elopement.
Divergence develops between Lord Leadenhall, a friend of Joslyn's, and his offstage family, as a consequence of Leadenhall's engagement to Rosaline, as he tells his friend, "There was an awful flare up in the family" (page 43).

In the course of the play, convergence is either affirmed or reaffirmed for each of the above relationships. Mable is reunited with his daughter Florence in the final act after recognizing Walkinshaw to be his brother.
A surrogate paternal relationship has already developed between Mable and Florence in the course of the play: Mable tells Florence of his search in Act Two, concluding "when I do find her, I hope she may not be unlike you" (page 41). Surrogacy is actualized when Florence meets with Mable, en route to Paris. Florence reveals to him the reasons for her flight, and he promises to keep an eye on her for Joslyn's sake (and with whom he has already struck up a friendship). Florence asks Mable, "What makes you so like a father to me?" (page 62), so that an enduring convergence between father and daughter seems assured.
Mable is also reunited with his brother in the final Act

and leads the other in saying that they forgive Walkinshaw,[9] suggesting the potential for the development of a convergent relationship between the two men.

Joslyn and his mother are also reunited. With the revelation of Walkinshaw's actions, in respect of Florence and Mable, Lady Hammersmith asserts "I believe this wretch's motives have been mean and dishonourable" (page 76). Walkinshaw, as a barrier between mother and son, has been rejected by each, facilitating their convergence.

The basis of the divergence between Leadenhall and his parents is removed with the cancelling of his proposed marriage to Rosaline.

Convergence is also evident in the establishment of a new familial unit, with the imminent marriage of Joslyn and Florence. Effectively, Joslyn has gained a father, as Mable states "Here is my daughter - yes, and my son, too" (page 78); while Florence has gained a mother in Lady Hammersmith.

Static familial divergence is evident in In Chancery in the person of Montague Joliffe, who is completely alienated at the opening of the play. Joliffe is suffering from amnesia, as he tells the Doctor, "I haven't the least idea who the devil I am, whence I came, or where I'm going" (page 140). He assumes that his name is Joliffe because of a named card case he has found in his pocket.

Meanwhile, the real Joliffe and his wife arrive. Having married without the consent of Mellina's trustees, they travel incognito as Mrs. Smith and her servant John. Joliffe, reading of the exploits of the real Joliffe and believing these to be his own, takes flight from the

pursuing Scotland Yard detective and Patricia whom he is about to marry.

Familial divergence becomes convergence in the final Act, titled 'Home Sweet Home', as Joliffe unwittingly takes sanctuary in an apartment house managed by a Mrs. Jackson. It is gradually revealed that 'Joliffe' is the missing Marmaduke Jackson, Esq. Joliffe's (Jackson's) memory returns, precipitated by the familiarity of the items in the room. As Joliffe is reunited with his wife they rush into each other's arms, she wiping a tear from her eye, as soft music plays in the background (page 61).

However, the play is not yet over as a convergent familial relation is as yet unassured, because Mrs. Jackson initially refuses to believe her husband's account of having lost his memory. That she is finally drawn to her husband is precipitated by the arrival of Patricia's father, producing her defence of her husband from McCafferty and his proposed duel. The strength of the family tie is evident in her assertion, "Whatever his faults, he's the father of little Freddy" (page 69).

As Joliffe's (Jackson's) story is corroborated by the fortuitous arrival of letters from 'Mrs. Smith's' trustees in London, familial convergence is actualized. Mrs. Jackson asserts that she believes her husband and the play closes upon their embrace.

Familial divergence in <u>The Hobby Horse</u> occurs in the estrangement of Spencer Jermyn from his son Allan, as well as the unsatisfied wishes of his new wife for a family. Jermyn and his son had parted eighteen months previously as the result of a quarrel. Six months later, Jermyn

married Diana. Jermyn wants a reconciliation with his son, as he tells Pinching, his solicitor "bring my boy back to me again" (page 17).

Mrs. Jermyn's love of children leads her, unbeknown to her husband, to the East End of London and into the role of Miss Moxon, companion to the niece of Reverand Brice. Diana's aim is to offer comfort to the deprived children in the area.

Tom Clark, alias Allan Jermyn, resides with Brice, and a surrogate maternal relationship develops between Mrs. Jermyn and Allan, whom she does not yet know to be her step-son. Allan confides in Diana his love for Bertha, Brice's niece, concluding "You're so good and beautiful in your way as Bertha is in hers" (page 71). Allan tells Diana of his father "(we) quarrel awfully" (page 69) but concedes "He's great fun" (page 70). A reaffirmation of the ties between father and son seems possible given the attitude of each for the other. Bertha's affection for Mrs. Jermyn is evident in her tears when she believes Diana may soon be leaving (page 94).

As father and son are reunited they embrace warmly, Allan agreeing to return home with his father. Mrs. Jermyn not wanting her husband to know of her role as Miss Moxon secretly returns home.

Act Three opens shortly before Spencer and his son arrive home. Convergence is evident in the relationship between Mrs. Jermyn and Allan as she reveals that she is his step-mother. She calls him "my own dear little boy" and he replies, "Mother, dear" (page 132).

Mrs. Jermyn's escapade is gradually revealed to her husband and he forgives her.

Familial convergence in The Hobby Horse occurs as existing ties are reaffirmed, as between father and son; new ties are developed, between 'mother' and son; and, as the family unit is enlarged, with the imminent marriage of Allan to Bertha. It is agreed that the extended family should live together, as a farmhouse on the estate is to be refurbished as "A home for Allan and Bertha" (page 167). Mrs. Jermyn anticipates "(a) time, when there are three or four babies rolling upon the grass" (page 167).

Familial divergence in Dandy Dick is evident in the prolonged estrangement of brother and sister. Twenty years earlier, the very Reverend Augustin Jedd had severed all connection with his sister Georgina following her marriage to a racehorse owner and jockey, now deceased. Divergence is also evident in the one parent family consisting of the Dean and his two daughters, Salome and Sheba.

Familial convergence is achieved in two stages: firstly, with the return of Georgina and then as familial relations gradually converge.

The Dean initiates a physical reunion with his sister. Reacting to her entrance, however, he recoils (page 29) in horror at Georgina's manner which is loud and brash:

> Surely, surely the serene atmosphere of
> the Deanery will work a change. It must!
> It must! If not, what a grave mistake
> I have made. (page 33)

Sibling divergence is similarly evident in his reasons for inviting his sister to live with them, which are mercenary: "She will help to keep the expenses down" and patronising: "Ill luck fell upon her...That was my hour. 'Come to me', I wrote,..." (page 27). Given the Dean's antagonism to

his sister's career, their continued divergence seems assured with Georgina's revelation to Sir Tristram that she still owns half a horse, called Dandy Dick. Furthermore, Dandy Dick is to be run in the local races the following day.

Surprisingly, it is through horse racing that brother and sister come together. The Dean, while possessing only five hundred pounds, had pledged to give one thousand pounds to the Steeple Restoration Fund. Georgina's help, in the form of a tip that Dandy Dick is assured of winning his race is initially rejected by the Dean, "Go to your room!" (page 76).

Sibling convergence is foreshadowed as the Dean shows himself increasingly amenable to his sister's passion for horse-racing, giving his butler fifty pounds to place on Dandy Dick. Attempting to cure the horse of a chill, the Dean is arrested on suspicion of poisoning the horse.

Sibling convergence is further developed with Georgina's instinctive defence of her brother. Not only does she give a description to the police, which is antithetical to her brother's, as being that of the suspect, but she also tells Sir Tristram in reference to her brother's likely motive, "I can't think. The first thing to do is to get him out of this hole" (page 129).

Georgina gains his release by soliciting her old track friends to 'rescue' the Dean from police custody. As it is revealed that the Dean's butler had failed to place the fifty pounds on Dandy Dick, Georgina asserts that she will "lend you that thousand for the poor innocent old Spire" (page 162). Convergence is evident in the Dean's initiation

of physical contact with his sister, as he takes her hand, "Oh, Georgina!" (page 162).

The relationship between the two sisters and their Aunt is divergent only prior to their meeting. As the sisters confer, "Salt in her bed, Salome!", "Yes, and the peg out of the rattling window!" (page 290). Georgina's affection for her nieces is seen in her frequent embraces.[10] She demonstrates her allegiance to the girls in her resentment that they were planning to attend a ball without her knowledge, "Do you think I can't keep a thing quiet?! (page 94). For their part, the girls call her 'Aunt' as well as confiding in her.[11] It appears likely that Georgina will fill a surrogate maternal role for the pair as the Dean had anticipated prior to her arrival, believing Georgina would become "A second mother to my girls" (page 26).

Static familial divergence exists in Sweet Lavender in the person of Dick Phenyl, alienated from any familial ties. Ruth Holt functions as a single parent to her daughter Lavender, who believes her father to be dead. The central family is physically divergent initially, with Clement Hale in London, while his adopted father, Geoffrey Wedderburn, Aunt, Mrs. Gillfillian and cousin, Minnie, are on the continent.

Divergence in terms of familial relations appears imminent between Mrs. Gillfillian and Minnie, due to the latter's unwillingness to marry Clement. Dick is estranged from his uncle. Divergence between Clement and Wedderburn also appears imminent given Clement's determination to marry Lavender, socially and economically his inferior.

Surrogate familial ties are established between Dick and the Wedderburns as a consequence of Dick's care and concern for the entire family following the loss of their fortune. Dick is shown cleaning the house (page 121); as well, it is recalled that he has made breakfast and read newspapers to Wedderburn (page 165). As a result, Mrs. Gillfillian, formerly antagonistic to Dick asserts "I like you," (page 132). Dick in turn is allowed to call her Aunt. Wedderburn requests that Dick, "will not, I hope, refuse to make your home with us at Barnchester" (page 178).

Dick had been estranged from his uncle, as he recalls "I washed my han's of him twen'y years ago - on account of his habits. I should say *my* habits" (page 100). The breach appears healed as his uncle leaves Dick his entire fortune in his will.

Mrs. Holt learns that Clement's adopted father is the same man who had abandoned her eighteen years earlier with an unborn child. Her immediate reaction is to flee, however she returns, along with Lavender, in the final act to nurse Wedderburn. Prior to learning that Lavender is his daughter, he already demonstrates his attachment to the girl, initiating a walk in the garden (page 163). With the revelation by Ruth of his relation to Lavender, Wedderburn asserts to his daughter "you must try to forgive my old unkindness to your mother and learn to call me father" (page 125). The strength of the maternal bond between mother and daughter is summed up by Ruth, "she's myself" (page 80). To Ruth, Wedderburn claims "what I've lost now is little compared to what I flung away eighteen years ago - the love of a faithful

woman" (page 171). The potential exists for the establishment of a formal familial relationship, with the marriage of Wedderburn and Ruth.

Early in the play Dick warns Clement not to pursue his relationship with Lavender, "if you offend your father... you'll be a pauper;" (page 23). When Wedderburn learns of Clement's wish to marry Lavender he attempts to dissuade him, giving Clement an ultimatum, "She or I - which is it?" (page 114). Clement is prevented from giving his answer by the arrival of the news concerning the fate of the family bank. As a result of the closure, Clement and Wedderburn are brought down to much the same economic level as Lavender. Also in Act Three, Lavender endears herself to Wedderburn as his daughter. The father-son bond is reaffirmed when Wedderburn blesses his adopted son's forthcoming marriage (page 175).

Clement reveals to Dick the expectations held by the family that he will marry Minnie, "Mrs. Gillfillian's daughter and I were thrown together as children" (page 24). Believing Clement and Minnie to have argued, Mrs. Gillfillian appears horrified, "You haven't quarrelled!" (page 83). Conversely, her joy when she mistakenly believes them to be engaged is obvious to the audience - *Triumphantly, to herself* "It's settled! I'm sure of it!" (page 84). However, the convergent mother-daughter relationship does not appear undermined with Minnie's announcement that she is to marry Horace Bream, an American. Mrs. Gillfillian, while not ecstatic at the match, raises no objections.

At the end of Sweet Lavender the main characters converge in a web of familial and surrogate familial relations.

The potential strength of the maternal bond is demonstrated in the relationship between Lady Vivash and her daughter Sylvia in The Weaker Sex.

Lady Vivash's affection for her daughter can be seen in her anguish at her daughter's absence on holiday, "I want to see Sylvia so badly," (page 36), and her joy at her daughter's return, "Sylvia! Sylvia!" (page 42).

Sylvia confides in her mother her love for a poet, Ira Lee, while Lady Vivash's love for a man called Phillip Lyster whom she knew in her youth has been revealed to the audience. Thinking of him, Lady Vivash tells Sylvia, "'a woman's first love is her religion'" (page 140). Meeting Lyster after many years, at a party during the play, Lady Vivash reaffirms her love for him, "I have prayed for you night and morning!" (page 110). Only with the entrance of Sylvia does it become obvious to Lady Vivash that Phillip Lyster is also Ira Lee.[12]

Lady Vivash's selflessness in favour of her daughter is revealed in her decision that her daughter shall never know that 'Lee' was her former lover. Unwittingly, Sylvia learns the truth. Sylvia, showing herself to be equally selfless in favour of her mother, tells Lady Vivash, "I was selfish ever to think of leaving you. We'll never part, dear;" (page 140).

However, Lady Vivash persists. Approaching Lyster, she tells him:

> You must make her happy again...If only I could know she was happy, I could be content to live out the rest of my life away from her; (page 143)

Lyster, unbeknown to either Lady Vivash or Sylvia, resolves to leave, "Once my shadow is taken from the lives

of these two women, there will be light again" (page 146). Told of his flight, the final Act, entitled 'Mother and Daughter' closes as Lady Vivash goes to Sylvia and *'they tenderly embrace'* (page 148).

At no time during the play had either mother or daughter expressed jealousy, resentment or even anger toward the other, so that the convergent nature of their relationship was never seriously in jeopardy.

CHAPTER TWO

INTER-SEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS

Static divergence is evident in Pillars of Society in those persons existing outside of an inter-sexual relationship, namely Hilmar, Lona and Martha.
In terms of matrimonial divergence, Bernick admits to a former lover that financial considerations were paramount in his choice of a wife, "I wasn't in love with Betty... It was simply and solely for the sake of the money" (page 72). The marriage of Bernick and Betty is presented in the play in terms of distance. As Bernick complains of his wife, "she's never been any of the things I've needed." Lona, his wife's sister retaliates, "Because you've never shared your interests with her (page 110). This is borne out in Bernick's public announcement of his intention to fund a new railway, which functions, simultaneously, as the announcement of his intentions, to his wife (page 39).
It becomes obvious that Bernick has, in his own mind, alienated himself completely from Betty. This is evident as Bernick laments to his wife the return of her relations "there isn't a single person here I can talk to or turn to for support," and in Betty's covert plea for acknowledgement, "Nobody at all, Karsten?" (page 50).
Similarly, Bernick views Lona and Johan as his wife's relations, rather than accepting them as his own, as he taunts her, "you can't help it if what? If they're your

relations? No, that's very true" (page 51). Further, Bernick allows Betty to suffer guilt and shame, because of them. Bernick's selfishness in marriage is evident in what he perceives to be his wife's merits, "in the course of the years she has learnt to accommodate her nature to my way of life" (page 73). Betty is shown as unable to check her husband's actions, as during his chastisement of Olaf, their son, "Don't argue, Betty, it's to be as I said" (page 79).

In his marriage, Bernick aims for the appearance, rather than the achievement, of marital bliss. As he cautions his wife, "don't let anyone notice anything" (page 79) and:

> go and sit outside, somebody might come in. Do you want them to say they've seen you with your eyes all red? (page 51)

The nature of their relationship appears to have changed at the close of the play, as a consequence of Bernick's confession, and his wife's acceptance of this. Betty asserts:

> for years I've thought that once you'd been mine and that I'd lost you.
> Now I know that you were never really mine; but now I shall make you mind. (page 124)

Not only does this appear contrived, as Betty accepts her husband without anger, or resentment at former deception, or jealousy at his infidelity; but, further, their reconciliation is not based on complete truth. Bernick does not confess his former relationship with Lona, nor his motivation for marrying, asserting that such matters "concern my own conscience alone" (page 123). Bernick's initiation of physical contact, as he puts his arm around his wife, rather than demonstrating love, can be interpreted

as the product of joy and relief, remembering how important the appearance of marital bliss was to Bernick.[1] Betty has not only publicly forgiven her husband, but publicly reaffirmed her love and loyalty for him.

The matrimonial relationship between Dina Dorf's mother and her mother's husband is presented in terms of the wife's infidelity, and the resultant separation of the couple (pages 33-4).

Rorlund, in his pursuit of Dina for his wife, is shown to destroy her self respect, presenting his love as charity, and himself as her saviour. As he tells Dina, "You *must* and *shall* be helped up" (page 38). When he eventually announces their engagement, it is in terms of "This step which I have decided upon for Dina's good" (page 99). As Dina concludes:

> he treated me like dirt...He felt he was lowering himself taking up with a poor creature like me. (page 105)

Unrequited love is also common for inter-sexual relations in Ibsen, as with Martha and Johan, and Lona and Bernick. As Martha recalls of Johan:

> my whole life is contained in (these) words. I loved him and waited for him. Every summer I waited for him. Then he came...but he didn't see me. (page 109)

Lona was rejected by Bernick after he had repeatedly assured her of his love (page 71).

It is debatable whether Dina loves Johan, with whom she travels to the United States and promises she will marry, or whether she perceives of him primarily as her means of escape. While agreeing to eventually be his wife, Dina asserts "I want to take care of myself. And over there I

can. If only I can get away from here" (page 106).

Divergence is evident in the matrimonial relations of Nora and Torvald in A Dolls House in Torvald's attitude toward his wife and her acquiescence to this, as well as in the existence of Nora's secret. That Nora functions as Torvald's pet is evident in the terms with which he refers to her, "my little squirrel," and "my little skylark chirruping" for example (page 202). Torvald's reiterated use of the pronoun 'my', as well as his determination to establish an exclusive relationship with his wife, demonstrates the possessive nature of his feelings for her. As Nora recalls to Mrs. Linde:

> When we were first married it even used to make him sort of jealous if I only as much as mentioned any of my old friends... (page 238),

and, Torvald himself reveals in his reaction to the news that Rank is dying, "perhaps it's all for the best...Now there's just the two of us" (page 274).
Torvald is shown to be scornful of Nora's sex, as he dismisses her assumption that he can borrow money to cover expenses as, "Just like a woman!" (page 203). As well, he belittles his wife's actions when he dismisses Nora's decoration of the christmas tree the previous year: "it turned out a bit of an anti-climax" (page 206).

Nora recalls her husband in the depersonalizing manner with which she refers to herself, "we call it a spendthrift" (page 206). Nora also demonstrates the extent to which she has assimilated her entertainment function, "I'll do anything you want me to, Torvald. I'll sing for you, dance for you..." (page 230). Nora stresses to Mrs. Linde her awareness of the importance of

her beauty, and her antics in retaining her husband's interest. She anticipates telling Torvald of the money she borrowed on his behalf:

> when I'm no longer as pretty as I am now...when he's lost interest in watching me dance, or get dressed up, or recite. Then it might be good to have something in reserve... (page 215)

The existence of Nora's secret is indicative of the gulf in relations between husband and wife. Nora is forced to assume the financial burden of repaying the debt to Krogstad, as well as the emotional and psychological burden of the consequences of her actions, without either the knowledge or support of her husband. The professed reason for her secrecy is a further indictment of their relationship:

> Torvald is a man with a good deal of pride - it would be terribly embarrassing and humiliating for him if he thought he owed anything to me. It would spoil everything between us. (page 215)

The secret grows with Krogstad's blackmail of Nora, of which Torvald is equally unaware.

Divergence between husband and wife is actualized as Torvald acts upon the knowledge of Nora's debt to Krogstad, turning on his wife while insisting that their marriage "appear to go on exactly as before. But only in the eyes of the world" (page 276). With the removal of Krogstad's threat to expose Nora, Torvald attempts to reaffirm his relationship with his wife, while the terms in which he does so establish a continuity with his character at the opening of the play:

> Here I shall hold you like a hunted dove I have rescued unscathed from the cruel talons of the hawk. (page 278)

The matrimonial relationship is terminated by Nora verbally, and physically, with her exit.

Matrimonial divergence is similarly presented as a feature of Mrs. Linde's relationship with her husband, now deceased, "(he left me) nothing at all...not even a broken heart to grieve over" (page 208).

The relationship between Rank and Nora appears as either unrequited or forbidden love, depending on one's interpretation of Nora's feelings for Rank.
Rank admits to Nora in Act Two "I have loved you", and asserts that he would "gladly give (my) life for your sake" (page 248). That his feelings may be reciprocated by Nora is suggested with her flirtation, as she shows him her new silk stockings, (page 247), and as she implies that she already knew of his love for her, claiming of his confession, "it was all so unnecessary..." (page 249). Furthermore, Nora tells Rank, "there are those people you love, and those people you'd almost rather be with" (page 250). The revelation that Rank is dying, destroys the potential for the establishment of an inter-sexual relationship between them in the future.

Popular opinion within Ghosts assumed the matrimonial relationship between Captain and Mrs. Alving to have been convergent. Manders shares this assumption, believing that the Captain, "live(d) a quite irreproachable and affectionate life with (his wife)" (page 372). As the truth is revealed to him, the Pastor concludes, "your entire married life...all those years together with your husband...were nothing but a facade" (page 375).
Mrs. Alving admits that she was encouraged to marry Alving for mercenary reasons, influenced by her mother and two aunts, who showed, "how it would be sheer madness to turn down an offer like that" (page 381).

Alving and his wife were both unhappy. Mrs. Alving left her husband after one year, but was persuaded to return, and remained, even though:

> To keep him at home in the evenings...
> I had to join him in secret drinking
> orgies up in his room...and listen to
> his obscene, stupid remarks. (page 376)

That Alving was also unhappy Mrs. Alving understands near the close of the play:

> he could never find any outlet for
> (his) tremendous exuberance...And I
> didn't exactly bring very much gaiety
> into the home, (page 413),

admitting her own culpability in her husband's search for happiness in the company of drunks and other women. The divergence central to their marriage is actualized with the death of Alving.

The former marriage of Engstrand and Johanna, from what is revealed in the course of the play, demonstrates an absence of love, both in the circumstances of their union, and their subsequent relationship. Johanna married Engstrand due to necessity, as she was at the time carrying Alving's child. Engstrand recalls that she had previously "only had eyes for the good-looking ones" (page 389). It is possible that Engstrand married Johanna because of the money he knew Alving to have given her.[2] Concerning his relations with his wife, Engstrand remembers Johanna's "nagging" and the fact that she was "Always so stuck up" (page 351). Regine, defending Johanna, claims of Engstrand that he "drove her to death the way (he) tormented her" (page 351).

Marriage in Ghosts similarly appears as a means of disposing of people. Mrs. Alving and Manders agreeing in

reference to Regine "we must get her out of the house" (page 380) adds, "Don't you think the best thing would be if we could see her settled? Decently married..." (page 386).

The establishment of an inter-sexual relationship between Oswald and Regine is shown to be based upon their, mutual, mercenary aims. To Regine, Oswald is the means of travelling to the cosmopolitan cities of the West. This is evident in her study of French in anticipation of a promised trip to Paris, as well as her involuntary reaction to Oswald's assertion that they may remain where they are when married, "Here!" (page 404). To Oswald, Regine is the "joy of life" (page 402), as well as a potential tool in his future suicide (page 419). She is also "marvellous looking" (page 399).

Actual divergence comes with the revelation of their biological relationship and Regine's resulting departure.

The inter-sexual relationship between Manders and Mrs. Alving ended as Manders forced Mrs. Alving to return to her husband. Professing to have been motivated in this by his consideration for her responsibilities as a wife, "your duty was to stand by the man you had chosen," it is likely that the selfish consideration of his own reputation actually swayed him, "It was extremely inconsiderate of you to seek refuge with *me*" (page 372).

The tenuousness of inter-sexual feeling is further suggested with the fate of Johanna, as with Anne Marie in A Dolls House, in that each is alienated from her former lover, even though each relationship had left her with child.

The responsibility for the marriage of Hjalmar and Gina in The Wild Duck is exposed as emerging not from within their relationship but from outside, in the person of Haakon Werle.

Because of the potential consequences of her sexual relationship with Werle, it is necessary for Gina to marry. As Gina later asserts when pressed by Hjalmar to reveal the identity of Hedvig's father, "I don't know!" (page 218). Hjalmar is shown to have been unwittingly manipulated into marrying Gina, by Werle.[3]

The nature of the marital relations between Gina and Hjalmar suggests an analogy with those between employer and employee, due to the inequitable nature of the division of labour. Not only does Gina fulfil the functions of a housekeeper, but she effectively manages the photography business also. Hjalmar belittles his wife's role to Gregers, conceding "The routine jobs I generally leave to her" (page 186).

That Gina and Hjalmar do not converge as husband and wife is indicated in Gina's failure to confide the circumstances of her past, and of their marriage, to her husband. Hjalmar later attacks Gina for "this web of deceit you've spun around me like a spider" (page 204).

That their fifteen years of marriage has been unable to compensate for the tenuous relationship upon which it was based is exposed when Hjalmar asserts that had he known what sort of woman Gina was he would never have married her (page 203).

Hjalmar leaves his wife, and yet returns in the final act. A degree of marital convergence is suggested by the ease with which Gina is able to persuade her husband to remain.

With the death of Hedvig, Hjalmar and his wife are shown together, carrying the child into her room, as Gina asserts "We must help one another" (page 241). And yet, this suggestion of convergence is undermined by Relling, as he indicates the tenuousness of Hjalmar's feelings. Retorting to Gregers' assertion that Hjalmar has finally demonstrated nobility, Relling adds "Most people feel some nobility when they stand grieving in the presence of death" (page 219).

Mercenary tendencies appear to have motivated Werle in his choice of a wife, as Gregers taunts his father:

> That must have been a bitter pill to swallow when you found you had miscalculated, after expecting her to bring you a fortune. (page 196)

Werle's dissatisfaction with his marital relationship is indicated in his pursuit of Gina, for example. Gregers refers to his "poor, unhappy mother" and "all those things she had to put up with till in the end she gave way and went completely to pieces" (page 146). That Werle's wife sought to retreat through alcohol appears likely as Werle suggests, "those eyes were...clouded, now and again," while Gregers retorts, "But who bears the blame for my mother's unhappy disability" (page 149).

Divergence is evident also in the former marriage of Mrs. Sorby, as exposed in Relling's comparison of Werle with her former husband, "Mr. Werle never gets drunk - And I don't suppose he's in the habit of knocking his wives about either" (page 209).

The final judgement upon marital relations rests with Gregers' claim concerning 'True' marriages, earlier defined as those in which "there's no deception underneath"

(page 191) - "I hardly think I've seen a single one" (page 207).

The potentially transitory nature of inter-sexual relations is suggested in the experiences of Relling and Mrs. Sorby, and Gina and Werle. As Mrs. Sorby asserts of Relling, to Gregers "Once upon a time it looked as if we might have made something of it, the two of us" (page 210), while suggesting the possible reason for their break-up in characterizing Werle, "he hasn't gone and squandered what was best in him" (page 209). Similarly, the relationship between Gina and Werle proved itself unable to endure beyond the revelation that Gina may have been 'with child'.

The marriage of the Rosmers in Rosmersholm resulted in the unhappiness of each partner. Rosmer was unhappy because he was tied to Beata, as he recalls "her wild fits of sensual passion... which she expected me to respond to. Oh! How she appalled me" (page 324), while Beata'a unhappiness appears due to her awareness of her husband's increasing alienation from her. In the mistaken belief that he was protecting his wife, Rosmer admits, "I think I did my utmost to keep her away from anything (Rebecca and I) were interested in" (page 339). As well, Beata was convinced of her husband's desire for Rebecca, a possible reason for her suicide as Kroll suggests "(she) put an end to her own life so that you might be happy" (page 325). Indicative of the gulf between husband and wife is Beata's unwillingness to confide in Rosmer. Believing him to be about to abandon his faith she turns instead to her brother Kroll; "why didn't she talk to me about it?" (page 325), asks Rosmer. Accepting Rebecca's tales of her pregnancy, Beata confides in Mortensgaard, causing Rosmer to lament,

"she never turned to me. Never said a word to me about it" (page 326). With Beata's suicide, the marriage was terminated.

Divergence in the marriage of the Kroll's is now becoming evident. This gulf initially appears ideological, from Kroll's words as he refers to his wife:

> All her life she has shared my opinions and agreed with my views...Yet even she tends sometimes to take the children's side... (page 302)

However, a deeper level of acrimony becomes evident as Kroll continues, "And then she puts the blame on *me* for what has happened. She says I domineer the children, bully them" (page 302).

The existence of Kroll's former extramarital attraction to Rebecca is implied in Rebecca's assertion, "there was a time when you felt an extremely strong *faith* in me" (page 353).

Concerning the offstage marriage of the Gamvik's, Rebecca's mother and her mother's husband, the infidelity of the wife is suggested (pages 355-56).

The inter-sexual relationship between Rosmer and Rebecca is initially described in such terms as "our pure and beautiful friendship" (page 351). However, the apparent convergence is undermined in the penultimate act with Rebecca's revelation to Rosmer of her lies and deceit. Rebecca confesses that her reasons for initiating the relationship were selfish:

> I wanted to be in at the dawning of the new age...Mr. Kroll told me about the great influence Ulrik Brendel had one had over you,...I thought I might manage to pick up again where he left off. (page 360)

Further, she had deceived Rosmer through her failure to reveal her role in Beata's death (page 361). Rebecca's

confession alienates her from Rosmer, who returns to town with Kroll, while she, in turn, plans to return to the North.

Is their collective suicide indicative of convergence?

In their final meeting, Rosmer appears as a broken man, "I have no faith any longer in my power to change people. I have no faith in myself anymore. No faith in either myself or you" (page 373), and later, "there's nothing left in me to save" (page 379). Rosmer's suicide can be seen as borne out of his despair. The apparent sighting by Mrs. Helseth of the White Horses further suggests a correlation between Beata's death and that of Rosmer and Rebecca. As such, the inter-sexual relationship between Rosmer and Rebecca appears as a destructive force, enticing both to their death.

To interpret their collective suicide, and their 'marriage' immediately prior as indicative of convergence, is to accept that such convergence is anomalous to this world.

Numerous examples of divergence in courtship relations can be found in The Lady from the Sea. Armholm recalls the "luckless proposal" (page 42) he once made to Ellida. Lyngstrand's pursuit of Bolette appears due to expediency - his need for a wife, as evident in her inter-changeability with her younger sister, Hilde, for Lyngstrand's purposes.

Lyngstrand believes the role of the wife of an artist, which he is, to consist of "smoothing his path by looking after him, seeing to his wants, and making things nice and pleasant and comfortable for him" (page 87). Deciding that

when it comes time for him to marry "(Bolette) will be a bit too old for me" (page 116), he turns his attentions to Hilde, "When I come home again, you'll be about the same age as your sister is now. Perhaps you'll even look like her" (page 117). Marriage for Lyngstrand, either convergent or divergent, is unlikely given his imminent death.

Ellida recalls the background to her marriage to Dr. Wangel:

> the plain truth is...that you came out there...and brought me...
>
> I wasn't a scrap better than you. I accepted your terms. I went and sold myself to you...
>
> I did not come to your house of my own free will. (pages 98-99)

Arnholm, years later, attempts to purchase Bolette in a similar way, promising the financial assistance necessary for her to achieve her aim, "to get away... to see the world...to learn something" (page 111). Bolette's immediate reaction to his proposal is horror, "No, no, no! It's impossible!" (page 112). However, when Arnholm retorts that should her father die she may have to marry for money anyway, Bolette appears to weaken, "Perhaps it's not so impossible after all", asserting, "I shall see something of the world" (page 114). What potential can there be for convergence in a marriage when an individual allows herself to be brought, as Bolette has done?

Hedda's decision to marry Tesman, in Hedda Gabler, appears the result of an initial decision to marry, "I'd really danced myself tired...I had had my day'..."and then... he came along and was so pathetically eager...to support me" (page 207). Marriage for Hedda appears a place to which

she can retire in the autumn of her years, as she perceives the present to be. Of love, Hedda cautions Brack later in the play, "Ugh...Don't use that glutinous word!" (page 206). Tesman's attraction to Hedda's pedigree, because of his own pride, appears in part the reason for his marriage. This is evident in his reaction to Aunt Julle's "to think that you'd be the one to walk off with Hedda Gabler!" as Tesman *'hums a bit and smirks'* (page 175).

In their marital relations, the extent to which Hedda alienates herself from her husband's concerns, such as the expected 'contest' with Ejlert Lovborg,[4] and the death of his Aunt Rina,[5] is matched by Tesman's insensitivity to his wife's needs. Of the honeymoon, Hedda recalls "He's absolutely in his element if he's given leave to grub around in libraries."... "But for me!" (page 205). Referring to the life they have led since their return, Hedda bemoans, "I'm bored..!" (page 212). Immediately prior to his wife's death, Tesman refuses her offer of assistance, further alienating Hedda from himself and his work, and perhaps, unwittingly pushing her into suicide. As Tesman decides that Thea should move into Aunt Julle's where he will visit her in the evenings, Hedda appears to plead, "And how am I supposed to survive the evenings out here?" (page 268).

The breadth of the gulf between husband and wife is evident in the fact that Tesman appears to have no inkling of his wife's intentions, as he yells to Brack, "shot herself! Shot herself in the temple! Think of that!" (page 268).

The divergence central to the relationship between Thea and her husband is evident in her decision to leave

him, as well as her reasons for doing so, "we just haven't a thought in common. We just don't share a thing, he and I" (page 192).

Inter-sexual relationships in the play follow a similarly divergent pattern. Hedda broke off her relationship with Ejlert, "this secret intimacy, this companionship" (page 222) because "there was an imminent danger that the game would become a reality" (page 223). As they converge again, physically, in the course of the play, Lovborg appears as Hedda's victim, "for once in my life I want to feel that I control a human destiny" (page 230). It is Hedda who leads Lovborg to his death, as she makes a present of one of her pistols to him, and instructs him, "use it now," (page 250), which he does.

The relationship between Thea and Ejlert initially appears convergent, as suggested in Thea's passionate, "I just know that I must live here, where Ejlert Lovborg's living...If I have to live at all" (page 194). Similarly, Ejlert gave up his "old ways" because he knew that Thea did not approve, (page 194). However, in his meeting with Hedda, Ejlert expresses a degree of contempt for Thea, she is "too stupid" to understand the previous relationship between Hedda and Ejlert, and "things like that" (page 224). That Thea felt necessary to follow Ejlert to town suggests her doubts concerning his resolve.

The vulnerability of their relationship is indicated by the ease with which Hedda is able to interpose, stimulating mistrust and resentment, and therefore to divide the pair. For example, Ejlert, having succumbed to Hedda's manipulation agrees to join Tesman and Brack in their proposed revels,

despite Thea's pleas, "Oh Lovborg...don't do it!" (page 229). In their final meeting, the day after Brack's party, and following the loss of the manuscript, Ejlert tells Thea, "it's all over between us now" (page 246). Thea rejoins, "There's nothing but darkness ahead of me" (page 248).

Inter-sexual convergence, in each of the plays by Pinero, takes the form of either the establishment of a new relationship or the reaffirmation of an existing one.

In The Squire inter-sexual divergence is present at the opening of the play in the relationship between Kate Verity and Eric Thorndyke. Unable to publicly acknowledge their marriage, as Eric's mother will disown him, should he marry in her lifetime, Kate and Eric are forced to live apart, and to restrict their time together, to avoid suspicion. Their separation, at this stage, is due largely to the character of Eric, as Kate asserts, "your pride would never allow you to share my means" (page 34). However, at the end of Act One, an acknowledged union seems assured, due to Kate's assertion that she is with child, and Eric's acceptance of the need to make public their marriage, immediately.

Before the close of the Act, however, an added threat to convergence emerges in the persons of Izod and Christiana, each aware of Eric's covert nocturnal visits to Kate, and each bearing a grudge against her. In Act Two, this threat is compounded by Pastor Dormer's revelation to Kate, not only that Eric had been married previously but that unbeknown to Eric, his first wife is still alive (page 51). Rejecting her husband, Kate destroys his photos and his letters, asserting as he comes near, "Don't touch me or I

shall drop dead with shame" (page 56). Permanent divergence seems imminent with the news that Eric's regiment is to be posted to India, where "many a gravestone marks the end of a short life" (page 71).

The undesirability of such divergence is evident from the presentation of its effects upon Kate, a sympathetic character in the play, who appears in Act Three, *'white and worn'* (page 64).

The balance is tipped from divergence to convergence in the space of a single scene, midway through the final act, as each impediment to the union of Kate and Eric is successively removed. Firstly, a change of character becomes evident in Eric, as his former pride is replaced by concern for his new family, as he resolves, "I've no thought but for you, dear, and the little heart which is to beat against yours" (page 75). Kate, in turn, concedes that he may write to her, (page 76). The Parson, having been told of their lawful marriage by Kate, and therefore no longer believing the relationship to be illicit, preaches to the assembled villagers a missive against 'Tale Bearers', (page 80), neutralizing the threat posed by Izod and Christiana.

The final barrier to union lies in the existence of Eric's first wife. Immediately prior to the close of the play, a messenger brings the news of this woman's death.

The play closes with the Pastor's announcement of the <u>forthcoming</u> marriage of Kate and Eric, unwittingly differentiating their past, of which divergence was a feature, from their future. The love of Kate and Eric for each other has never been seriously questioned in the play, and now their physical union is assured.

The Rocket chronicles the eventual union of Joslyn Hammersmith and Florence, as well as the reunion of the Chevalier Walkinshaw and his estranged wife Rosaline.

Joslyn and Florence, as sympathetic characters, are obviously compatible, and understandably fall in love. A short-lived threat to their union surfaces as Walkinshaw spies Joslyn kissing Florence, and in his anger asserts, "Mr. Hammersmith, unfortunately the days of duelling are extinct or you would suffer for the blow you have dealt..." (page 20). However, learning of the Hammersmith fortune, Walkinshaw quickly assents to their union (page 23).

In Act Two, acrimony is shown developing between Joslyn and Walkinshaw due to Joslyn's hostility toward Walkinshaw's relationship with Lady Hammersmith. Joslyn perceives Walkinshaw's motivation to be mercenary. Divergence is actualized between the young couple, as Florence, sacrificing her own happiness, resolves to leave Joslyn so that he will be "free to teach my father the lesson he deserves" (page 49).
The barrier to the convergence of the young couple has been personalized in the character of Walkinshaw, and Florence's unwillingness to subject the Hammersmith family to his machinations. In the final Act, Walkinshaw is eliminated as a threat to their union: firstly, as he is spurned by Lady Hammersmith, who comes to regard him as "this wretch" (page 77), and secondly, as it is revealed that Walkinshaw is not in fact Florence's father (pages 76-77). Consequently, the forthcoming marriage of the young pair is joyfully acknowledged at the close of the play.

Rosaline, introduced in Act Two, is unsure whether her estranged husband is even alive. In the course of the

Act it becomes obvious to the audience that Walkinshaw is Rosaline's husband.

In Act Three, Rosaline and Walkinshaw are thrown together as Lady Hammersmith chooses Rosaline to accompany her as she elopes with Walkinshaw. Meanwhile, having discovered Rosaline's proximity, Walkinshaw is concerned only to avoid being detected by his wife.

As his true identity is revealed, Rosaline claims her husband, forgoing her proposed match with Lord Leadenhall in the process. The reestablishment of the marital unit is comically evident in Rosaline's threat to chastise her husband for abandoning her, "when I get you home" (page 78) and Walkinshaw's silent assent.

Inter-sexual convergence, as evident in the reunion and reconciliation of Marmaduke Jackson and his wife in In Chancery, is detailed in the previous chapter which focuses upon familial relationships. Such convergence is also evident in the eventual recognition of the marriage of Mr. and Mrs. Joliffe (alias Mrs. Smith and John) as well as the proposed marriage of Patricia and Dr. Titus.

The union of Joliffe and Mellina is illegal, because Mellina, a ward of the court, has married without the consent of her trustees. Consequently, the pair face permanent separation should they be located.

Hinxman, a detective, yet unaware of 'John's' identity, reveals to the young man that the penalty for marrying a ward of the court without permission is, "A year or two in prison" (page 46). Just as Hinxman is about to discover the truth, the fortuitous arrival of a letter facilitates convergence. Aware of the admirable character of Joliffe,

the trustees resolve to "withdraw from all action in the matter," (page 71), thereby accepting the union of Joliffe and his wife.

Patricia is attracted to 'Joliffe', as Jackson assumes himself to be, and they become engaged, with her father's blessing, (page 24). The wedding preparations occupy much of the second Act. As the wedding is about to take place, Jackson, believing himself to be sought by the police, flees. As part of the spirit of convergence which predominates in Act Three, Patricia too, is integrated into an inter-sexual relationship. As the wedding party descends upon 'Joliffe', it becomes obvious to them that he is already married, and therefore unable to marry Patricia. At this point, Dr. Titus, a constant companion of the McCafferty's, proposes to Patricia, and is accepted (page 71).

Aeneas Posket in The Magistrate asserts near the opening of the play, "my entire marriage is the greatest possible success" (page 11). Conversely, that divergence potentially threatens their future relationship can be seen in the existence of his wife's secret, which she outlines to her sister: "Underestimating Aeneas' love,...I took five years from my total, which made me thirty-one on my wedding morning" (page 15). Agatha claims that she cannot tell her husband the truth, because "I should have to take such a back seat for the rest of my married life" (page 16). With the unexpected arrival of Colonel Lukyn, an old friend of each of her two husbands' as well as being her son's godparent, the exposure of Agatha's deception seems assured. The contingencies of her plan to silence Lukyn precipitate the 'first tiff' between husband and wife, culminating in

Agatha's refusal to allow Aeneas to walk her to her cab (page 22).

Simultaneously, Posket is shown surreptitiously arranging to visit the Hôtel des Princes with Cis, his wife's son, to enable the latter to repay a debt.

In Act Two, Posket and Agatha are shown in adjoining rooms at the hotel, each unaware of the proximity of the other. As they are each about to leave, a police raid takes place, due to the hotel being open after hours. Agatha, her sister Charlotte, Lukyn, and his friend Vale are arrested, while Posket and Cis manage to escape.[6]

In the Third Act, those arrested appear before the magistrate, Posket, who in shock sentences his wife and her sister to "seven days without the option of a fine" (page 54). Even though Bullamy, an associate of Posket's,[6] arranges for their release, marital divergence only intensifies. Agatha greets her husband *'fiercely'* as "the man who condemned his wife and sister-in-law to the miseries of a jail" (page 68). He in turn asserts, "we will have a judicial separation, Mrs. Posket" (page 70).

Just as the repeal of their marriage seems assured, Posket explains that the responsibility for his clandestine visit lay with Cis, precipitating Agatha's confession, beginning "Aeneas, I see now this is all the result of a lack of candour on my part..." and concluding, "as long as I live, I'll never deceive you again - " (page 72).

Charlotte, Agatha's sister, announces in Act One her engagement to Horace Vale, having accepted his proviso banning "flirting 'til after we're married," (page 14). Shortly after her arrival, Charlotte receives a letter from

Vale telling her "By jove all is over,"..."your desperate flirtation with Major Bristow...has just come to my knowledge" (page 17). Charlotte begins to weep. Coincidentally, Charlotte and Vale are reunited at the Hôtel des Princes. Prior to their meeting, Vale had lamented to Lukyn that "my heart is broken" (page 28) demonstrating that he, no more than Charlotte, desires separation.

Divergence becomes convergence as Charlotte is able to explain her present of slippers to the Major, "was a debt of honour" (page 41), and Vale concedes "I've been a brute" (page 42). Indicative of love, Charlotte lays her head on his shoulder, while he calls her "My darling" (page 41). The truth facilitates convergence for Charlotte and Vale, just as for Agatha and Posket. Furthermore, once the truth is known, this transition is both immediate and straightforward.

The Magistrate opens upon the seemingly convergent relationship between Cis and Beatie, his "poor little music mistress" (page 5). Believing himself to be only fourteen he asks Beatie, who is sixteen, *'lovingly* will you wait for me?" (page 8). And yet, the capacity of Cis to make such a commitment is undermined by what appears the fickle nature of his affections. Popham, the parlourmaid to the Posket's, claims herself to be, "a young lady who up to last Wednesday was all in all to you" (page 8).

However, by the final Act of the play, the character of Cis seems to have undergone maturation. Even prior to the revelation by his mother of his true age, Cis asks Beatie, having ascertained that no lady could marry a

gentleman who had been a convict, "could I write out a paper promising to marry you when I'm one and twenty?" (page 65). To this 'proposal' Beatie agrees. As Cis asserts, "when I feel inclined to have a spree, I shall think of that paper and say, 'Cis Farrington, if you ever get locked up, you'll lose the most beautiful girl in the world'" (page 68). With the announcement of their engagement, "Guv-Mater! here's news! Beatie and I have made up our minds to be married" (page 73), the potential for an enduring convergence is actualized.

Miss Dyott is the principal of a school for girls in The Schoolmistress. Her marriage to the Hon. Vere Queckett remains a secret because "my husband could never face the world of fashion as the consort of the proprietess of a scholastic establishment" (page 20). The pragmatics of their union recalls the marriage of Gina and Hjalmar: Caroline married Queckett because it was her ambition "to wed no-one but a gentleman" (page 20), and he married her for her money. Their relationship is presented in terms of Queckett's parasitic dependence upon his wife as she pays all his bills as well as providing "the elaborate necessities of his present existence" (page 22). This marital divergence intensifies as each proceeds to deceive the other. Miss Dyott is to be Queen Honorine in a new comic opera, while telling her husband she will be visiting "a Clergyman's wife at Hereford" (page 157). Queckett covertly resolves to entertain his friends in his wife's absence, at the school, which he describes as his "Bachelor lodgings" (page 33).

Discovering her husband's deceit, Miss Dyott addresses him as "You mean, ungrateful little creature! You laced-up heap of pompous pauperism!" (page 153). He, in turn, is repulsed by her new profession, "what do you think my family would think of that?" (page 157), and forbids her to perform again, an order that she asserts she will ignore (page 161).

As their acrimony reaches a pitch, Bernstein reads aloud the reviews of Caroline's performance that evening, concluding "You have made a great hit in my new oratorio" (page 164). While Hjalmar in The Wild Duck is presented as unable to change, the opposite is true of Queckett, as he offers his support to his wife, whom he calls "my darling," in her new career (page 166).[7]

The marriage of Admiral and Mrs. Ranking is similarly rehabilitated in the play. Their relationship initially appears in terms of the Admiral's persistent bullying of his wife: "Don't twitch your fingers,"..."Speak louder" (page 39), and "Stop that fidgety cough," (page 40). In Act Three, following Caroline's example, Mrs. Ranking resolves "to speak my mind at last" (page 149). Having examined their relationship, she concludes "I have worried and fretted you with my peevish ill humour -"... "As you have worried and worn me with yours" (page 150). The change in the nature of their relationship is evident as the Admiral subsequently asserts to his wife, "I have no desire but to please you" (page 166).

Like the Quecketts, Dinah Ranking and Reginald are secretly married, as Dinah's parents refused to condone their relationship. Dinah begins the play locked in her

room at the school, where her parents have instructed she is to remain, as a punishment for "fallin' in love" (page 3). In the final Act the pair are reunited as Mrs. Ranking uses her new influence with her husband to gain his acceptance of the relationship.

Having met at Queckett's party in Act Two, where they danced together, Peggy, a pupil at the school, and Mallory, a friend of Queckett's become engaged to be married in the final Act.

The gulf which exists between Lady Twombley and her husband in The Cabinet Minister is evident in Sir Julian's delusion concerning the nature of his wife. As he asserts to a friend, "(my wife) is really of an extremely thrifty nature," (page 55), when in fact the audience already knows her to be a spendthrift, now seriously in debt. In desperation, Katherine turns to a disreputable money-lender, Joseph Lebanon. Actual marital divergence is precipitated as Sir Julian overhears his wife bargaining with Joseph, and consequently turns upon her (page 153). Their mutual love unshaken, the pair are reconciled in the final Act as Katherine promises her husband that she will never be indiscreet, nor extravagant, again (page 188). Inter-sexual harmony is suggested as the play closes upon them dancing a reel.

In the Second Act, it is revealed that relations between the Earl and Countess of Drumdurris "have become terribly strained" (page 58). The basis of their disagreement concerns the future career of their son: Army or Politics. Without his wife's knowledge, Keith gives his son a war toy, and as a consequence of eating the paint,

the child becomes ill. Although he recovers, his parents learn their lesson, resolving "To reconcile our views" (page 78).

Valentine White and Imogen Twombley, former playmates who are reunited in the first Act, initially appear incompatible. Valentine has spent many years in exile from England due to his opposition to 'ceremony', in all its various forms. The potential for convergence appears as Imogen exits in Act Two only to return with some of the toys they had played with as children, suggesting that she is the same person now as she was then.

In the final Act, Valentine demonstrates that he is able to meet Imogen halfway, to her pleasure, as he appears in immaculate dinner dress (page 181), such as he had previously shunned. Imogen, in turn, chooses to marry Valentine, conscious that the present pecuniary position of each family renders them penniless.

Brooke Twombley and Lady Euphemia Vibart become secretly engaged in Act Two, as Effie expects "bother with mamma" (page 106), due to the depletion of the Twombley family fortune. The Dowager, as she learns of their engagement, attacks Brooke, "how dare you conspire to entrap a child of mine into a moneyless marriage" (page 178), implying the enforced divergence of the pair.

In the final Act, that Brooke becomes acceptable to the Dowager, as a son-in-law, due to the reestablishment of his family fortune, is evident as she allows them to dance.

The inter-sexual convergence which dominates the final Act of the play is symbolized in the reel, which the four couples - the Twombleys, the Earl and Countess, Imogen and Valentine, and Brooke and Effie - dance together.

CHAPTER THREE

FRIENDSHIP RELATIONS

The 'friendship' relation between Consul Bernick and Johan Tonnesen in Pillars of Society adheres to the norms of mercenary motivation in Ibsen. That Bernick calculatedly initiated, and subsequently used, his friendship with Johan as a means to serve his own ends is made obvious in the play: Bernick used Johan to gain access to the latter's sister Betty, beautiful and destined to be wealthy; and, also as a scapegoat in his own illicit relationship with a married woman (page 63). Bernick was also responsible for spreading a rumour concerning the thieft of a cash box (page 85), further denigrating the character of the young man.

However, the play also suggests that the mercenary impulse to friendship was mutual. As Johan recalls:

> how proud I was of that friendship! There was I, miserable little stick-in-the-mud still plodding along at home; then along you came, fine and elegant, just back from your grand foreign tour...But how proud I was! Who wouldn't have been? (page 63)

Further, it is suggested that Johan's acceptance of the blame fifteen years earlier was not a selfless act of kindness to a friend in need. It is possible that Bernick not only provided Johan with the opportunity but also the financial means to escape to the United States.[1]

In the reunion of these old 'friends', their essential divergence is evident in the willingness of each to destroy the other, to save himself. Bernick refuses to reciprocate the 'sacrifice' Johan made for him fifteen years earlier, instead turning upon him as he pleads "give me back my name and reputation," (page 90). Bernick threatens, "if you open your mouth, I'll deny everything! I'll say its part of a plot against me...revenge..." (page 91).

Slander develops into Bernick's horrific resolution to kill Johan as the means to silence him.[2]

Reacting to Bernick's refusal of assistance, Johan asserts "(I will) Get my own back on the lot of you. Smash as many of you as I can" (page 99).

The role of extrinsic value in maintaining a friendship is evident in the relationship between Mesdames Rummel, Holt, Lynge and Mrs. Bernick. In the opening to the play, the womenfolk are shown unified as 'The Society for the Protection of Moral Delinquents'. Conversely, with the demise of Mrs. Bernick, in terms of social value, which results from the return of her disreputable relations, these women chose to alienate themselves from their former friend.

Divergence in terms of friendship is further evident in those characters who appear alienated from such relationships. Bernick's young son, Olaf, is consistently referred to as playing by himself, whether at home or when exploring the docks. No reference is made to even any acquaintances among his peers.

Similarly, Martha, Bernick's sister, appears singularly devoted to her philanthropy - as teacher, and through her association with invalids.

Dina perceives the young Netta Holt and Hilde Rummel not as friends, but instead relates their acquaintance to the charity she feels is due to a moral delinquent such as herself.[3]

Bernick, when faced with the surprise return of Lona and Johan asserts that he has no-one to turn to (page 50).

The importance of extrinsic considerations to the maintenance of friendship relations is further evident between Torvald and Krogstad in A Doll's House. Concerned for his own social reputation, Torvald is determined to replace his former friend Krogstad at the bank. That this attitude is unrelated to Krogstad's performance Torvald admits, "I'm told he's not bad at his job," (page 242). Instead, rumours of Krogstad's past forgery and subsequent moneylending, have made him a liability as a friend. Torvald is able to dismiss their former relationship as "one of those rather rash friendships that prove embarrassing in later life" (page 242). The link between 'convergence' and the mercenary impulse in Ibsen is highlighted in Torvald's *volte face* as he learns that Krogstad has the means to sully his reputation, "I must see if I can't find some way or other of appeasing him" (page 276).

A mercenary tendency is also evident in Krogstad's determination to reaffirm his former relationship with Torvald as the means to salvage his shattered reputation. His attempt to establish himself at the bank as being on familiar terms

with Torvald,[4] can be seen as calculated to make it difficult for Torvald to act against him without appearing to be influenced by the course of their personal relations.

It would appear that Torvald chose to maintain his friendship with Rank, also for selfish reasons, as he tells Nora, "His suffering and his loneliness, seemed almost to provide a background of dark cloud to the sunshine of our lives" (page 274). The tenuousness of Torvald's feeling for his 'friend' is evident in his reaction to the news that Rank is dying, "perhaps it's all for the best...now there's just the two of us" (page 274), he tells Nora. Rank's association with Torvald is, implicitly, sustained by his desire to have legitimate access to Torvald's wife. As he tells Nora, "Sitting here so intimately like this with you,...I simply cannot conceive what would have become of me if I had never come to this house" (page 247).

The mercenary attachment to a former friend is also evident in the sympathetic character of Mrs. Linde. Kristine is candid to Nora about her response to the news that Torvald had been made a Bank Manager, "when you told me the good news about your step up, I was pleased not so much for your sake as for mine" (pages 211-12).

With regard to Nora, the extent of Torvald's possessiveness has meant that Nora has been alienated not only from her former friends,[5] but, it is likely, from making new friends also. At the end of the play, Nora's actions in leaving her family will make her even more of a liability as a friend should she return, than did Krogstad's previous misdemeanours.

In terms of recognizable friendship relations, Ghosts is extremely bereft. Although Mrs. Alving describes Manders at one point as her "close friend," (page 372), their relationship is more correctly defined as inter-sexual. The same is true of the relationship between Oswald and Regine.
Of Captain Alving it is said, "He never had a single real friend" (page 412).
Neither Oswald himself, nor any of the other characters refer to his having any friends or even acquaintances among his peers at home.

The relationship between Manders and Engstrand comes close to being a recognized friendship.
Divergence is necessarily a feature of the relationship as long as Manders remains acquainted with Engstrand, only as the latter chooses to project himself, rather than with the man as he really is. For example, Manders appears to genuinely believe of his reason for drinking, "He says he's often driven to it because of his bad leg" (page 364).[6]
Manders is reminiscent of Bernick as he allows Engstrand to take the blame for the fire at the orphanage, rewarding Engstrand for doing so, as he promises "you'll get support for your Seamen's Home" (page 410).
Engstrand's treatment of Manders appears as a parody of true friendship, as he aims, primarily, to deceive or manipulate the Pastor, especially concerning the nature of his character. Consequently, Engstrand approaches Manders, suggesting "I was thinking we ought perhaps to finish up this evening with a bit of a service" (page 386), adding, "I often used to say a prayer or two myself down there in the evenings" (page 387). While it is not certain that Engstrand

is responsible for the fire at the orphange, it is certain that he resolves to take advantage of what has happened, at Manders' expense. As he tells Regine, "Now we've got him nicely" (page 407) before asserting to the Pastor:

> I quite distinctly *saw* you take the candle and snuff it with your fingers and chuck the end away, straight into some shavings. (page 407)

Engstrand suggests his own reward as he precedes his offer to accept the blame with "Don't forget my Seamen's Home, Pastor!" (page 409).

The relationship between Haakon Werle and Old Ekdal, in The Wild Duck, is revealed initially by rumour, in terms of Old Ekdal's apparent treachery: "Supposed to have done the dirty on old Werle once...so they say" (page 132). In the course of the play it becomes obvious that Werle planned that his 'friend' and not himself would receive the blame for the illegal felling of timber, as he does not disagree with his son's assertion of "The wrong that's been done to Old Ekdal" (page 196).

The motivation for Wer treachery was selfish, as it centred upon the desire to protect his own reputation. This is evident as he explains the degree of assistance he has since given the old man, "I have gone just as far as I ever could, short of laying myself open to all sorts of suspicion and gossip" (page 145).

The extent of such treachery can be seen in Act One in the contrast between the two men: one, the congenial and prosperous host, the other, prematurely old, and broken. Haakon's divergence from Ekdal is further evident as he expresses his regret that they were ever friends, "he was a bit too close I'm afraid. And I wasn't allowed to forget

it either for years afterwards" (page 144).

The relationship between Relling and Molvik appears less as a friendship than a professional relationship, as between doctor and patient. This is obvious as Relling explains to Gregers the principle of the life-lie, "it's a tried and tested method; I have used it on Molvik...I have made him a 'demonic'. That's the particular cure I had to apply to him" (page 226). Relling's scorn for his 'friend' is demonstrated as he tries to silence Molvik following Hedvig's death, "Shut up, man! You are drunk!" (page 241).

Relling's relationship with Hjalmar which also appears in the guise of friendship, is conducted along similar lines. As Relling explains their association to Gregers:

> I'm supposed to be a Doctor of sorts, aren't I...? I have to do something in the way of looking after the sick who are living in the same house as me, poor things. (page 225)

In answer to Gregers' questions as to what treatment he is giving Hjalmar, he replies, "the usual. I try to keep his life-lie going" (page 226).

Gregers and Hjalmar appear as old friends reunited in Act One. Even at this stage, the tenuousness of their former relationship is suggested as it is revealed with what ease Hjalmar was able to be persuaded of Gregers' apparent antipathy toward his family, while Gregers, in turn, was convinced that Hjalmar did not want to hear from him (page 35).

Their relationship appears convergent in Act Three, as Gregers moves into the Ekdal house, and also in the amount of time the pair spend together.

And yet, this relationship comes to parallel that between Relling and Molvik, as Gregers also aims to 'save' his 'friend', declaring his life's work is "to open Hjalmar Ekdal's eyes" (page 195), and later, "to lay the foundation of a true marriage between Gina and Hjalmar (page 199). Relling depersonalizes the relationship as he equates the motivation for Gregers' attraction to Hjalmar as being the same as that which drew him to people up at the works, "Now you are at it again, coming to another labourer's cottage with the claim of the ideal" (page 225). Relling further suggests that Gregers does not see Hjalmar as he really is, describing Hjalmar, aptly it would seem, as "the sentimental sort...(who had) learned the knack of reciting other people's poetry and other people's ideas" (page 225) while Gregers retorts " [*indignantly*] is this Hjalmar Ekdal you are talking about?" (page 225).

The relationship between Gregers and Hjalmar regardless of whether it can be justified as friendship, is unequivocably destructive. Gregers through his revelation of the truth concerning the past lives of Gina and his father, is responsible for nearly destroying the marriage of Hjalmar and his wife. He is also responsible for the death of Hedvig, although he does not actually pull the trigger, as he persuades her of the need to make such a sacrifice.

Mrs. Sorby and Gina appear closely acquainted and yet could they possibly be friends if Beata knew, which she apparently does not, that Werle is potentially the father of Gina's daughter? It is certain that the pair will be separated in the future as Mrs. Sorby is to move out of town with Werle (page 211).

The terms with which Rosmer and Kroll in Rosmersholm greet each other after a long separation "my dear fellow," and "my dear old friend," (page 299), appear to suggest a convergent friendship relationship. However, that Kroll saw fit to alienate himself from Rosmer following Beata's death, "I didn't want to appear as a living reminder of those unhappy years...and of her who met her end in the millstream" (page 299), demonstrates that rather than perceiving friendship as potentially positive - as a source of comfort and emotional assistance, Kroll believed that such an association could only foster unhappy memories.

When Kroll visits Rosmer in Act One, although initially appearing to have visited as a friend, it soon becomes obvious that his motivation is mercenary, that is, to gain Rosmer's support against the Radical faction. As he tells Rosmer, "I can at least do my bit as a citizen, anyway. And I think it is incumbant on every patriotic and right-minded man to do the same" (page 302), he is preaching and not conversing.

As well as Kroll's authoritarian stance, the ideological differences which become increasingly obvious further point to the divergence of the pair. Rosmer having revealed to Kroll that his life's work is to create "a true democracy in this land" (page 314), attacks his 'friends' political manner:

> When I heard of how violently you had been carrying on at the public meetings ...When I read about all the uncharitable speeches you made...Oh Kroll...how could you turn like that! (page 315)

Kroll, in the ease with which he is able to turn upon Rosmer at this point, demonstrates that his ideological

beliefs are more important to him than his 'friend'. As he asserts:

> Any man who is not with me in these critical matters, I want nothing whatever to do with. Nor do I owe him any consideration. (page 316)

Further, as he threatens, "We will not let you get away, Rosmer. We will force you back on our side again" (page 316), what at first appeared as a personal relationship is mutually transformed into a battle between two factions. As Rosmer adds, "I shall never come back" (page 316). When Kroll acknowledges their friendship in a subsequent visit (page 321), this is calculated to endear him to Rosmer, preceding as it does his attempt to destablize the relationship between Rosmer and Rebecca, which he perceives necessary to gain Rosmer's support. Unsuccessful, Kroll resorts to attacking Rosmer in *The County Times*, slandering him as a judas-like creature, (page 348).

The guise of friendship is also used by Kroll's sympathizers - former friends of Rosmer, to undermine his sense of vocation, requisite to his allying with them, "They made it quite clear that the task of enabling the minds of men...is not really the thing for me" (page 367).

Mortensgaard, a leader of the Radical faction, initiates a relationship with Rosmer for similarly mercenary reasons. Mortensgaard's aim is to secure the Rosmer name for his cause, "What the party badly needs is Christian elements - something that everybody has to respect" (page 332).

Ulrik Brendel appears in Act One, like Kroll, as a friend from Rosmer's past, greeting him as "my boy...my

well beloved" (page 307). Brendel borrows from Rosmer, never to return, items of clothing as well as money.

Rebecca is established early in the play as having had a very close relationship with Rosmer's wife. As Rebecca confides to Kroll, "I was so genuinely fond of Beata" (page 297), while Kroll adds, of Beata, she idolized you, worshipped you" (page 297). Only later in the play does it become obvious that Rebecca used the guise of friendship to mask her plan to destroy Beata. Rebecca aimed to secure Rosmer's apostasy, and to this Beata was a barrier. Rebecca accepts responsibility for Beata's suicide, "It was I who lured...who ended by luring Beata out on to the twisted path" (page 361), after bringing her to despair, having revealed her husband's likely apostasy "She was informed that you were ridding yourself of all your old-fashioned prejudices" (page 361), as well as the potential love of Rebecca and Rosmer for each other. "I gave her to understand that if I stayed on...certain things...might happen" (page 361). Finally, Rebecca encouraged Beata's belief that as a sterile wife she should make way for another (page 362). As Rebecca concludes, "I wanted to get rid of Beata" (page 363).

Brack, in Hedda Gabler further demonstrates the importance of the extrinsic measure of value in friendship relations. At the opening of the play,Ejlert's reputation, mirroring the course of his career, is on the rise. At this stage, Brack's manner is profuse, "Wouldn't you do me the very great honour of joining us?" (page 217) he solicits Ejlert.

Brack's subsequent antipathy toward the young man is precipitated by the latter's downfall in terms of social regard, as Ejlert becomes for him "that imbecile Lovborg" (page 242). As he tells Hedda, "From now on every decent home will be closed to Ejlert Lovborg" (page 243), adding, as he obviously perceives Lovborg a liability in terms of his own reputation, "I must admit I'd find it extremely awkward if this fellow were to become a constant visitor here" (page 243).

Tesman can be seen to adhere to this trait, as regards extrinsic value, also. The previous severing of his relations with his 'old friend' Lovborg, appears coincidentally (?) to have dated from the time of Ejlert's initial downfall, as from this point Tesman's intelligence regarding Ejlert appears exclusively the product of hearsay.

The reaffirmation of their relationship follows Lovborg's social rehabilitation with the appearance of his new book. In the first Act, Tesman's apparent concern for the financial welfare of his 'friend' (page 198) and his promise of assistance (page 188) is soon undermined, when he learns that Lovborg may be his rival for the professorship "This is quite unthinkable! Quite impossible!" (page 200). This attitude, in turn, contrasts with that with which he subsequently greets Lovborg "my dear Ejlert" (page 215). His concern for his 'friend', "you must behave just as if you were at home, Ejlert!" (page 215), appears hollow, following as it does his spirited expressions of self-concern at Lovborg's expense. Later in the play, he admits his jealousy of Lovborg's talent, as he tells Hedda, "I sat

and envied Ejlert that he'd been able to write such a thing" (page 236).

Hedda uses the guise of friendship with Thea for mercenary ends: initially to solicit information, and later to further her plan for Lovborg.

Hedda reveals her antipathy toward Thea early in the play when she refers to her as "That woman with the provoking hair that everyone made such a fuss of" (page 184). Conversely, when Thea calls upon her, Hedda welcomes her as "my dear Mrs. Elvsted" (page 185). As she kisses Thea upon the cheek she asserts, "from now on you're to call me Hedda" (page 190), continuing "I'm going to call you my darling Thora" (page 190). The falsity of Hedda's apparent regard is evident in her mistake regarding Thea's name.

The motivation behind Hedda's dissembling becomes apparent to the audience, although not to Thea herself, when she 'casually' introduces Lovborg into the conversation, "Ejlert Lovborg's been up there about three years hasn't he?" (page 191).

Having promised Thea that she would not make known her visit to Lovborg (page 195), she goes back upon her word, (page 227). Hedda's aim is to control Lovborg's destiny necessitating as it does the destabilization of his relationship with Thea.

Lovborg's spurning of Thea, precipitated largely by the influence which Hedda has over him and the consequences of this, lead Thea to assert "There's nothing but darkness ahead of me" (page 248).

The ulterior motive behind Brack's friendship with Tesman is explained by his obvious sexual attraction to Tesman's wife.

In the *tête à tête* between Brack and Hedda in Act Two, Tesman becomes the object of Brack's scorn, as he asserts '[*a little maliciously*]' of Tesman's copying of parchments, "After all, that is his particular raison d'être" (page 205). Agreeing with Hedda that Tesman is a worthy person he adds, "Oh, solid worth. Heaven preserve us" (page 207). His attraction to Hedda is evident as he regrets not having known of Tesman's temporary absence, lamenting "I could have come out here...even a little earlier" (page 204). Further, he asserts seemingly in general, that:

> I demand no more than a nice, intimate circle of acquaintances,... where I'm allowed to come and go...as a trusted friend,

continuing,

> of the lady, for choice. (page 207)

Upon Tesman's return, he comments, "The triangle is completed" (page 208).

In Act Four, Brack attempts to blackmail the wife of his supposed friend into an illicit relationship, as he promises in turn to protect Hedda from both the police, and public scandal (page 265). Near the close of the play, he assures the unwitting Tesman that he will entertain his wife in his absence, "I'll gladly come every single evening... we'll have a fine time out here together!" (page 268). Hedda's determination to resist such advances, "subject to your will and to your demands...No! That's a thought that I'll never endure!" (page 266), can be seen to implicate Brack in the suicide of his 'friend's wife.

In The Squire, a convergent friendship relationship develops from the divergence of an inter-sexual relation. In the first Act, Gilbert Hythe learns that his love for Kate Verity is unrequited. As Kate tells him, "We were children together...but we mustn't be man and woman together" (page 16). Divergence is intensified as Gilbert's disappointment is transformed into his resentment of Eric Thorndyke, "The man who has robbed me of my hope - my ambition" (page 37). At the end of Act Two, Gilbert tries to shoot Eric. This can be seen not only as a crime against Thorndyke, but against Kate also, as Gilbert attempts to take her love from her.

Gilbert's decision to leave the farm not only actualizes his own divergence from Kate and Eric, but introduces divergence into the relationship between Kate and Gilbert's mother. His mother, now deceased, had been Kate's nurse, and it is likely that through Kate's relationship with Gilbert, her relationship with this surrogate maternal figure was preserved.

Divergence becomes convergence as Gilbert changes from being a twisted, forsaken love into a model friend, as he forgets his own hopes to secure the happiness of Kate and Eric. This process begins as Gilbert agrees to attend the harvest festival. Witnessing the unhappiness of Kate and Eric resulting from their separation, and although unaware of the reasons for this, Gilbert acts to reunite them. Consequently, it is he who tells Kate that Eric has been posted to India where it is likely that he will die. Further, Gilbert acts as messenger, telling Kate that Eric would like to see her, and when she refuses, succeeds in

persuading her otherwise. As he asserts, "My heart goes out to him. I can't bear that answer back" (page 72). At their subsequent meeting, the reconciliation of Kate and Eric takes place. Similarly, it is Gilbert who brings the news, immediately prior to the close of the play, that Eric's first wife has died, enabling Kate and Eric to marry. Together, these details suggest that not only has the breach between Gilbert and Kate been healed, but that a new relationship has been fostered between Gilbert and Eric also.

Mutual acrimony predominates in relations between the Reverend Paul Dormer and Eric, in the initial stages of the play.

To the Reverend, Eric is, because of his relationship with Kate, "a soldier lacking chivalry - a man who makes war upon weakness - a coward" (page 28). Further, he tells Kate, "Repair those old gates and keep that young gentleman on the other side of them" (page 26), continuing, "I demand that as long as you remain in this parish, Mr. Thorndyke be excluded from your house" (page 29).

In turn, Eric attacks the Reverend, asserting "a clergyman is the only man in the world privileged to be rude on the subject of another man's calling" (page 25).

Conversely, as the Reverend learns that Kate and Eric are married, rather than indulging in an illicit relationship, and also that Eric's first wife is now dead, a convergent manner toward Eric predominates. Not only does Dormer refer benignly to "our neighbour Thorndyke" (page 81), but also facilitates the legal convergence of Kate and Eric in the sense that he tells Eric, "You're a free man, sir, you're wife is dead!" (page 81).

In The Magistrate, friendship is not only enduring, but also active, in the sense that each party receives support, comfort and assistance when necessary.

The amiable nature of Bullamy's relationship with Posket, apparent in Act One, remains constant throughout the play. This affection is translated into actual assistance when Bullamy learns that Mrs. Posket is in jail, and that Posket is indisposed. As Bullamy asserts, "This won't do, I must extricate these people..." (page 67), which is exactly what he does.

Contributing to the comedy of the play, Bullamy further tries to protect his friend from the wrath of Mrs. Posket following her release, as he cautions her, regarding her husband, "It might cause a relapse" (page 69).

The relationship between Captain Lukyn and Vale appears similarly convergent. In Act Two, Lukyn encourages his friend to confide in him the circumstances of his broken heart, as he begins "So...you've been badly treated by a woman, eh, Vale?" (page 28). Confronted with his friend's tears, Lukyn assures him "(it) does you great credit," while confiding in turn, "My heart has been broken..." (page 29).

The seeming inviolability of their friendship is further indicated by the uniformity of their experience in the play. Together they are arrested and sent to the house of correction, just as together they confront Posket at the close of the play.

In The Schoolmistress, Peggy, Gwendoline and Ermyntrude spend much of the duration of the play in facilitating the reunion of their friend Dinah and her husband, Reginald.

The girls arrange for Reginald's infiltration into the school where Dinah is being held, united in their common purpose "to help Dinah...to free her from the chains of tyranny and oppression" (page 6). As part of their plan, a wedding breakfast is prepared for the couple. Their ploy uncovered, the girls continue their struggle in the home of Dinah's parents, enabling Reginald to enter the house as well as gaining Dinah's release from her room. The girls are successful not only in physically reuniting the pair, but thanks to their perseverence on the young couple's behalf, the relationship finally gains the acceptance of Dinah's parents (page 152).

The relationship between Constance Moxon and Dinah Jermyn in The Hobby Horse demonstrates that in Pinero a friendship founded in the childhood years is able to endure well into adulthood.

The Hobby Horse opens as Miss Moxon is preparing to leave the home of her friend, with whom she has been staying, lamenting as she does so, "I feel I shall never be happy again" (page 19). Constance, aware of Dina's love of philanthropic work and her ambition to visit the East End for this purpose, agrees to allow Diana to assume her identity and to work as a governess in this area. As she reassures her friend, "If you desperately wish it, why shouldn't you be Constance Moxon for two or three weeks?" (page 44).

The identity change having taken place, Constance remains silent, her loyalty to her friend taking precedence over even the inquisitiveness of Diana's husband. As Ralph Pinching is about to inadvertantly let slip Diana's absence

to Spencer Jermyn, Constance diverts Pinching's attention, choosing that exact moment to confess her love for him (page 52).

The ties between the two friends are further reinforced in the final Act with Diana's return, as Constance becomes engaged to Ralph, solicitor and friend to Diana's husband.

The friendship between Allan Jermyn and the Reverend Noel Brice was founded on the basis of their mutual assistance. As Brice recalls, "I interfered one night in a drunken riot...," struggling valiantly until Allan came to his rescue. Brice continues: "As Allan had just come ashore from a voyage...I got him a lodging upstairs, in this house" (page 62). Allan, conscious of his friend's poor health, resolves to "whip him off into the country, where he'll pick up his strength in a jiffy" (page 68). When Brice unwittingly gains a position at the home of Spencer Jermyn, Allan tells his father, "You've got hold of the finest chap in the world!" (page 104).

The friendship ties between the two friends are further cemented when Allan becomes engaged to Brice's niece, and surrogate daughter, Bertha.

Divergence becomes convergence in the relationship between the Dean and Sir Tristram Mardon in Dandy Dick as the two schoolfriends are reunited in the play, and their former friendship reaffirmed.

Although the Dean asserts when Mardon visits, "I am... heartily pleased to revive in this way our old acquaintance" (page 37) he is at this stage disapproving of Mardon's primary interest - horse racing. As he tells Sir Tristram, concerned

that his daughters will be corrupted by his talk, "Hush, Mardon! Please!" and later, "Hush my dear Mardon, my girls - !" (page 36).

It soon becomes obvious, however, that this barrier to convergence will be overcome, as the Dean is persuaded to place money on 'Dandy Dick' of which Mardon is part-owner. Later, the Dean asserts, "Every abused institution has its redeeming characteristic" (page 144). In the spirit of true friendship, Mardon strives to secure the release of the Dean when the latter is unjustly arrested for attempting to poison the horse. Sir Tristram offers to drop all charges, and when this proves insufficient to gain his release, is instrumental in the Dean's 'liberation'.

The friendship ties between the Dean and Sir Tristram are reinforced with the imminent marriage of Sir Tristram and the Dean's sister, Georgina.

The friendship between Major Tarver and Mr. Darby remains constant in the play. As with Lukyn and Vale in The Magistrate, convergence is indicated in the inseparability of their experiences: not only do they each belong to the same regiment, but they are simultaneously courting the two daughters of the Dean, to whom they become engaged at the end of the play.

As so often occurs in Pinero, friendship relations are supplemented, and therefore reinforced, by the addition of a familial tie.

Friendship in Sweet Lavender demonstrates the primary importance of intrinsic as opposed to extrinsic worth, in Pinero. Such relationships are shown crossing the barriers of social class as well as ignoring such matters as socially-determined reputation.

These points can be seen in the friendship of Clement Hale and Dick Phenyl. The stage directions for his first entrance describe Dick as being, *'a shattered and dissolute looking man'* (page 12), while his habitual drunkenness is evident in his slurred speech and unsteady gait. As Bulger the barber asserts, "I do wonder at a superior young gentleman like Mr. 'Ale stoopin' to reside with one of Mr. Phenyl's sort" (page 2). Clement challenges such an assertion, stressing "the good burns clearer and brighter in his slovenly person than in many" (page 11). As he tells the woman to whom he later becomes engaged, "We'll stick to old Dick, won't we?" (page 42). However, there are two reasons why divergence appears potential in their relationship: Clement's objection to Dick's drinking habits, and Dick's opposition to Clement's desire to marry the daughter of their housekeeper.[8] Potential divergence becomes strengthened convergence as Dick, his loyalty to his friend awakened by the opposition of Clement's aunt to the match, asserts "Now its come to it, I'll stick to you, Clement, my boy!" (page 51). Similarly, in line with Clement's hopes, Dick is able to swear in Act Three to having had "Not a drop for seven days" (page 128), a fact evident in his improved appearance.[9] Dick demonstrates the degree of his empathy for his friend in his plight to gain Lavender, as he refers to the two men as if they were one: "Oh, she loves us right enough," and, "this is the first time we have offered ourselves in marriage" (page 122).

The reciprocity of their disregard for extrinsic circumstances is obvious in Dick's constancy when Clement's family fortune is lost. Dick reacts to this by pledging his own newly

inherited wealth to assist the refloating of the family bank.

The friendship which has developed between Dick and Minnie is especially obvious as Dick pursues her would-be fiance on her behalf. Similarly, Dick reads to Clement's uncle, who is unwell, while Clement's Aunt asserts of her brother to Dick "he likes you" (page 132).
A new friendship based on a reciprocity of affection and regard is also evident for Minnie, Clement's cousin, and Lavender, his future wife. In Act Three, Minnie comforts Lavender in her distress at seeming to have lost Clement, while Lavender, in turn, is shown comforting Minnie as she confesses her love for the absent Bream. Lavender promises to accompany Minnie so that she may locate Bream, causing Minnie to assert to Lavender, "Oh, you darling! I'm so fond of you" (page 162).

The Profligate, first performed in 1889 can be seen to mirror the situation evident in The Squire, from 1881, as in both plays, a divergent inter-sexual relationship is transformed into a convergent friendship.
In The Profligate, Hugh's love for Leslie is unreciprocated as she regards him as a friend, and not a lover. Like Gilbert with Kate and Eric, Hugh initially resolves to destabilize the relationship between Leslie and Dunstan Renshaw, even though, as he is aware, this will mean unhappiness for Leslie.
Witnessing the pain they each suffer when they separate, following the reappearance of a woman from Dunstan's past, like Gilbert, Hugh resolves to reunite them, to his own cost.

In Act Three, Hugh has given refuge to Leslie as she flees from Dunstan, while unbeknown to Leslie, Hugh has arranged for Dunstan to visit her. Hugh's selflessness is evident as he asserts to himself, "There is no future for her except one of reconciliation with her husband," (page 115) and later, "if I can reconcile them it is my duty" (page 119). That his friendship is reciprocated is evident as Dunstan, in accepting Hugh's invitation, adds, "I feel sure that a friend's eyes will look on me in the morning" (page 120).

CHAPTER FOUR

INTER-CLASS RELATIONSHIPS

A tendency for a uniformity of social status among the characters is a feature of an Ibsen play. Those with low social status are, with few exceptions, represented as employees, and therefore as part of an economic, rather than a personal, relationship. That 'lower class' members are so scarce is in itself evidence of inter-class divergence in Ibsen.

A Power differential is shown to exist at the core of all inter-class relationships.

Aune, a shipyard foreman in Pillars of Society, recognizes this class divergence when he asserts, with reference to himself and his employer, "My society isn't Mr. Bernick's society" (page 24). A power differential is obvious in this relationship in the control which Bernick is able to exercise over Aune, within and without working hours.

Instructing Aune to merely patch the Indian Girl to make her seaworthy, Bernick threatens "if the *Indian Girl* isn't cleared by the day after tomorrow, you're sacked" (page 54). The impersonality of their relationship is obvious as it makes no difference to Bernick that Aune's "father and grandfather worked all their lives in the yard, just as I have" (page 54). Aune agrees to adhere to Bernick's demand, because should he lose his job, he would "have lost any

standing I ever had in my own home and among my own folk" (page 92). Aune's dilemma stems from the fact that the nature of the employer-employee relationship in Ibsen determines that he is not empowered to negotiate with Bernick.

That Bernick's control extends even outside the working hours of his employees is highlighted as Aune is told, on behalf of Bernick, "These week-end lectures of yours to the workmen have got to stop"... "First and foremost you've got your duty to...Bernick and Co." (page 24).

In the second Act, Bernick's scorn for the fate of his social inferiors is demonstrated as he admits that he would let Aune take the blame for what was his own decision, regarding the *Indian Girl*. Bernick feigns surprise when told the repairs to the vessel are a sham, "Good God!" (page 80). Bernick adds that should proof be secured, "Report it,... We can't make ourselves parties to what is clearly a crime" (page 81).

That the relationship between Nora and Anne-Marie, the nursemaid in A Doll's House is essentially a professional one, is embodied in the fact that while the maid is obliged to call Nora "ma'am" in public, Nora is privileged to call the servant by her first name.

Self-sacrifice is established as a one-way process in the only dialogue between the two women, as it is revealed that the maid gave up her own child to strangers, because of the obligation which she felt toward Nora's family, "there was nothing else for it when I had to come and nurse my little Nora" (page 236).

Helene's role in the life of the Helmer family is purely functional. The maid is seen in the play only briefly,

as she shows in guests and lights the lamps in Act Two, for example.

Inter-class relationships in Ghosts are established as inherently divergent.

In Act One, Regine claims to Engstrand that she is treated by Mrs. Alving "like one of the family, almost" (page 351). However, the difference between an employer-employee relationship and a personal one soon becomes obvious, in the inability of Regine to make the transition from servant to family member.

When first requested by Mrs. Alving to join her and Oswald, socially, in Act Two, the traditions of service are so entrenched for Regine, that she is unable to relate to Mrs. Alving other than as her social inferior. This is evident in Regine's extreme passivity, as she relies upon instructions, remaining standing until she is requested to sit, and silent, not being requested to speak (page 402). Similarly, in Act Three, Regine does not imagine that Mrs. Alving would approve if she called Oswald by his first name, and further, only *'hesitantly'* sits beside them (page 412).

As Regine learns that she is the daughter of Captain Alving she is no longer satisfied with the treatment she had received from the Alving's, contrary to her earlier assertion to Engstrand. As she tells Mrs. Alving, "I think you might have brought me up like a gentleman's daughter" (page 415), thereby recognizing the distinction between her own experience, in service, and the lifestyle afforded an equal of Oswald's.

The relationship between Engstrand and Pastor Manders seems to displace the above problem, as it suggests that the

impulse to converge is uncommon, because divergence is both accepted, and desired.

Engstrand, rather than aspiring to increase his social standing to approximate one such as Manders', is content to exploit his 'superiors', from a position of inferiority, for his own gain. To this end, Engstrand employs pretence and deception, against Manders. Engstrand feigns repentance concerning his drinking (page 390), and self-sacrifice with regard to his marriage (page 389), as well as deference in the manner in which he addresses Manders. As Engstrand reveals to Manders his need for financial assistance in establishing his Seamen's Home, his ulterior motive is revealed to the audience.

Manders' desire for the divergence of the classes is related to the ego gratification he desires from the acknowledgement of his social reputation, and social superiority within the town.[1] In his relations with Engstrand, Manders accentuates his superiority, addressing the former by his last name without a title, and backing away from his inter-personal advances. As he confides in Regine, while being pursued by Engstrand, "he's driving me to distraction" (page 406).

Regine also demonstrates that she is willing to exploit class distinctions. With Manders in Act One, Regine accentuates divergence, employing extreme deference requisite to her implied request to become Manders' housekeeper (pages 355-57).

Mrs. Alving's provision of an orphange, and Engstrand's desire to establish a Seamen's Home for officers, only appear on the surface to be convergent tendencies. The motivation for the establishment of the orphanage, rather than being convergent, as a philanthropic gesture based on

a concern for those likely to benefit, is instead divergent, as the impulse is selfish. For Mrs. Alving, the orphanage is to be the means by which she is able to rid herself of her husband's unhappy legacy, as she tells Manders, "That was my purchase price...I don't want any of that money to pass to Oswald" (page 377). Similarly selfish are the town's leading citizens, confident that the orphanage "will help considerably towards reducing the burden on the rates" (page 362-63).
Engstrand's motivation with regards to his Sailors' Home, is based on his expectations of profit.[2]

The relationship between Stockmann and his domestic servant Randina in An Enemy of the People is characterized by the anonymity of the latter. Ignorant of her name, Stockmann refers to "that girl who's always got a dirty nose" (page 115).

The working class, middle class and the wealthy class of local officials are presented as factions, antagonistic toward each other, in this play. The working class, represented by Hovstad, are primarily hostile to the class of officials. Hovstad's aim is to "(break) up this ring of obstinate old buffers (who've) got hold of all the power" (page 47), as he continues, "we'll just keep in hitting them ...time and again until the whole set-up collapses" (page 64). Horstad is motivated by his belief that what's needed most among the "humble and oppressed masses" (page 48) is "to have some say in the control of public affairs" (page 47). The Mayor, Hovstad's chief adversary at this stage, expresses privately his resentment of the working class, perceiving them in terms of an economic burden. As he tells the Doctor,

"The burden of the poor-rate on the propertied classes, has I am happy to say, been considerably reduced - " (page 25), and later with reference to Hovstad, "funny, these people of peasant stock! They never have any tact" (page 26).

Divergence between employer and employee is highlighted when the Mayor tells the Doctor, "as a subordinate member of the staff of the Baths, you have no right to express any opinion that conflicts with that of your superiors" (page 59), and further "when I give you an order, it's up to you to obey" (page 59).

In this play, it is established that the classes can at best ally, rather than converge. 'Ally' suggests the mutually advantageous nature of a (temporary) combining of forces, such as occurs in An Enemy of the People. Aslaken, representative of the 'compact majority' or middle class, and Hovstad, shift their support on the issue of the Baths, to the city's Mayor; Aslaken, because the success of the Mayor's antagonists would result in increased taxes for the middle class (page 77) and Hovstad, because it is in both his own personal interest, and that of the paper, to support the Mayor.

The history of Rebecca West's antagonistic association with Rosmer and his wife in Rosmersholm provides a further example of the divergence of employer and employee in Ibsen.

It would seem that Rebecca came initially to Rosmersholm as companion to Rosmer's wife, Beata.[3] However, her supposed affection for Beata is exposed in the play as no more than a blind, to obscure Rebecca's push for control over Beata, requisite to supplanting her. As Kroll claims to Rebecca,

"she idolized you...worshipped you" (page 297).
Rebecca's aim was to gain unrivalled control over Rosmer. To this end, Rebecca progressivley undermined the relationship between Husband and wife.[4] Finally, Rebecca was able to precipitate the suicide of her employer, Beata.

Class prejudice is evident in Brendel's dismissal of Mortensgaard, "Can't I tell straight away from his name that he is nothing but a plebeian" (page 308).

In Hedda Gabler domestic servants appear as commodities held in the possession of an employer. For example, Berte is passed from the service of Julle and Rina, into the hands of Tesman and his wife, at the discretion of Julle and regardless of Berte's wishes. As Julle tells her, "I found it more than hard to let you go," Berte replies, [*close to tears*] "And what about me then, Miss? What am I to say!" (page 172).
That Hedda similarly regards a servant as a possession is evident as she voices disappointment at their inability to afford a footman in virtually the same breath as she laments the prohibitive cost of a saddle horse (page 201).

Each of Pinero's plays from 1880-1890, contain a broad social spectrum, so that the potential for inter-class convergence is much higher in Pinero than in Ibsen. Similarly, in Pinero, inter-class relations are much more central to the drama.

Inter-class convergence in The Squire is presented in two main forms: in terms of a mutual loyalty and concern which is shown to cross social barriers, as well as in the form of friendship between persons occupying very different positions, in terms of social stratification.[5]

The allegiance of the villagers to their Squire is evident at the Harvest Festival in the final Act. The Festival itself can be seen as a symbol of inter-class convergence, as an occasion which unites the entire social spectrum of the village of Market-Sinfield.

In their first appearance as a group, the villagers break off their singing immediately they see the Squire at a window (page 64). In unison they shout, "Hurrah!" (page 65). When the Squire joins them, she is presented with a basket of fruit and flowers, while the crowd *'bob and curtsey'* enquiring "Mornin' Squire! How are you Squire?" (page 67).

Kate's announcement that she may be leaving the area, is greeted with sobs and tears from the crowd, who *'sorrowfully disperse'* (page 70). That the feeling demonstrated by the villagers towards Kate is reciprocated, is evident as the thought of leaving them all brings tears to her eyes also (page 70).

Kate's concern for the welfare of her employees can be seen in her reaction to the news that Rob John, now very old, is ill. As she questions his son, "have you sent the Doctor?" (page 130) adding as he leaves, "give my love (...to your father)" (page 131). The allegiance of RobJohn to his Squire can be seen in the message which he instructs his son to relay to Kate, concerning his ill health, "he hopes it'll make no difference" (page 130).

The extent to which Kate reciprocates the service of her villagers is highlighted on an occasion when the Square hears a doorbell ring late at night, "Perhaps poor Mrs. Tester has sent for me to read to her, or old Mr. Parsley wants me to witness another will - ?" (page 48).

The Squire's maid is able to assert of Kate, "(she) gives me the same living that goes to the best table" (page 11).

That friendship is able to develop across distinct social barriers is evident in the relationship between Kate and Felicity. Felicity, having been brought to Kate by her father, is taken into the Squire's house, as Kate asks, "would you like to be my little maid?" (page 31). Kate gives Felicity the room above her own. Her affection for the young girl can be seen in the frequency of physical contact - as Kate kisses her, draws the girl to her, and pats her cheek.[6] When eventually spurned by her love, Felicity confides in Kate who comforts her by kissing her forehead (page 66). Kate's loyalty to her friend is demonstrated in her reaction to the attempted blackmail by Christiana. The latter threatens to make public her knowledge of Eric's nocturnal visits to Kate, unless the Squire spurns Felicity, of whom Christiana is jealous. In reply, Kate asserts, "I promise to be a friend to little Felicity as long as she loves me and clings to me. Say the worst you can" (page 74).

The philanthropic relationship between employer and employee can be seen in The Magistrate. In this play, Posket's choice of staff is determined, primarily, by his desire for their rehabilitation. As he tells his wife, "all our servants,...everybody in my employ,... has been brought to my notice through the unhappy medium of the Police Court -" (page 10). With examples, he continues:

> Our servant, Wyke,...is the son of the person I committed to trial for marrying three wives...Cook was once a notorious dipsomaniac...Popham is the unclaimed charge of a convicted baby farmer... (page 10)

The potential for inter-class convergence is also evident in the development of an inter-sexual relationship between Beatie, an impoverished music mistress and Cis, the step-son of the Magistrate, Posket.

The opening of the play stresses the social distinctions separating the pair: Beatie, because of her position, is not invited to join the family for dinner, instead dining upon the fruit and nuts which Cis is able to pilfer on her behalf (page 5). That Cis's mother disproves of their protracted 'lessons' is evident as she announces, "We have no right to keep Miss Tomlinson so late" (page 9).

And yet, the play demonstrates that social barriers can be overcome, so that divergence can give way to convergence. Cis begins, as has been said, by bringing fruit and nuts to Beatie, while he is shown becoming progressively more demonstrative. In return for playing his music scales, he queries, "will you kiss me?" (page 9). Further, he does kiss her as she leaves in Act One (page 11). The seriousness of his pursuit of Beatie becomes evident as he pledges that when he is old enough he will marry her (page 65). Near the end of the play, his announcement to his parents, "Beatie and I have made up our minds to be married" (page 73), is accepted by Posket, who asserts "on the day you marry and start for Canada, I will give you a thousand pounds" (page 73). Consequently, Cis, embracing Beatie, asserts "Hurrah! We'll be married directly" (page 73).

Inter-class convergence occurs also in the form of a previous inter-sexual relationship between Cis and Popham, a servant in the Posket household. As she tells Beatie, referring to Cis, "me and him formed an attachment before

ever you darkened our doors" (page 63). Although no longer an inter-sexual relationship, inter-class convergence is shown to predominate in the final Act as Popham arrives with champagne and glasses on a tray, for the toasting of the newly engaged couple (page 73).

Peggy, an impoverished orphan, training to be a governess in The Schoolmistress is not only befriended by the pupils at Volumnia College, but also becomes engaged to a gentleman.

Peggy is shown to empathise with Dinah, the daughter of Admiral Rankling, separated from the man she loves by her parents. As Peggy asserts:

> I'm a poor governess, but playing jailer over bleeding hearts is not in my articles...if your husband comes...and demands his wife, he doesn't go away without you - (page 12)

Peggy further rallies Dinah's two friends, Gwendoline and Ermyntrude in support of this.

Inter-class convergence is also evident in the Honourable Vere Queckett's unwitting assistance to Peggy, in her plan to unite Dinah and Reginald. Queckett agrees to allow his bachelor party to act as a blind for the wedding breakfast; as well, he uses money belonging to his wife, the Principal of the school, to pay for the necessary provisions. When Peggy proves unable to do so, Queckett gives the signal for Reginald to enter the house, by whistling out of a window. Queckett similarly plays the piano so that the others, including Dinah and Reginald may dance.

An inter-sexual relationship develops between Peggy and Lieutenant John Mallory, a naval officer. In reply to

Peggy's question, "May I take you to the cigarettes?" (page 85), Mallory asserts "You may take me anywhere." The Lieutenant requests that Peggy dance a quadrille, while her answer demonstrates that his feeling for her is reciprocated, "I never dance... [*taking his arm*]. But I don't mind this once" (page 104). In the final Act he asserts, "What a jolly little sailors wife you'd make -" continuing, "I'm a sailor, you know," (page 127), before commenting in an aside, "I love that girl!" (page 134). Immediately prior to the close of the play he enters, and announces, "While looking at the flowers in the conservatory, I became engaged to Miss Hesserligge" (page 166).

Inter-class convergence in a somewhat different form can be seen in the nature of Miss Dyott's covert employment, and the unreserved acceptance of this by the end of the play.

For Miss Dyott, Principal of Volumnia College to perform in a comic opera is so at odds with the behaviour expected of someone of her class, that she sees fit to keep secret her activities. Not only does she fail to confide in her pupils, but actually lies to her husband (page 23). That her behaviour is to be seen as justifiably covert is suggested with her husband's reaction when he learns the truth, "I forbid it!" and, "what do you think my family would think of that?" (page 157).

When it becomes obvious, however, that his wife has been a success, Queckett's attitude changes, as he anticipates having his own private box at the theatre. The Rankling's similarly assert that they will be present.

It does not appear, to those assembled at the end of the play, dishonourable for the wife of the Honourable Vere

Queckett to perform on the stage.

Convergence by way of philanthropy in inter-class relations is further evident in The Hobby Horse. Spencer Jermyn intends to provide a home for "about twenty decayed jockeys...who have outlived their chances on the turf" (page 10), and plans to use a farmhouse on his land for his purpose. Further evidence of his concern for those socially inferior to himself occurs as he buys a ticket for Mrs. Landon, when he believes that she has an urgent need to travel to London.

Spencer's wife, Diana, is similarly involved with philanthropy, having given over their nursery to house local orphans. The strength of her philanthropic resolve becomes evident as she covertly travels to London to satisfy her ambition:

> to wander freely through the courts and alley's of the most wretched districts of London, finding small human treasures... (page 44)

Inter-class convergence is also apparent in the relationship which develops between Mrs. Jermyn (alias Miss Moxon); her employer, the Rev. Noel Brice; and his niece, Bertha.

Noel Brice falls in love with the, supposed, Governess, as he later tells her husband:

> I believed Miss Moxon to be a generous, warm-hearted Lady, whom any man should be proud to call his wife. (page 163)

Similarly, Bertha comes to consider 'Miss Moxon' her friend, evident as she cries when she believes her to be leaving, (page 94) and rejoices as they are united in the final Act (page 155).

Social distinctions are forgotten as Allan, the son of Spencer Jermyn, plans to marry Bertha, the niece of an impoverished Reverend. In the final Act, Spencer and his wife agree to "rebuild the old farmhouse...and furnish it sumptuously as a home...for Allan and Bertha" (page 167).

Miss Moxon had been forced into becoming a Governess as a means to provide a living for herself, as she recalls "my parents died almost before I was born" (page 20). In the course of the play, she becomes engaged to Ralph Pinching, a solicitor.

Inter-class convergence occurs in Dandy Dick in the continued allegiance of Hannah Topping to her former employer, the Dean of St. Marvells.
Hannah's husband, the local constable, places the Dean in custody when it is assumed that he had attempted to poison the horse, Dandy Dick.Learning that the Dean is to stand trial, Hannah asserts "You shan't be took to Durnstone!" (page 113). Failing in her attempts to win over her husband on the Dean's behalf, as when she clings to Noah's legs, Hannah settles upon a plan for the Dean's escape.[8]
At the end of the play, once the Dean's innocence is accepted, Hannah and her husband are treated to a meal at the Deanery.

Similarly, the friends and the employees of the Dean are shown unified in their support of Dandy Dick in the race he is to run. Blore, butler to the Dean, not only invests the savings of the Cook and House-maid, but the Dean also gives him fifty pounds to place on the horse.

Sweet Lavender further demonstrates that in Pinero love and friendship are emotions which are able to transcend social distinctions.

The mutual loyalty which exists between Ruth Rolt, a servant, and Dick Phenyl, a solicitor, is established early in the play. In defending Dick's character from an attack by Bulger, Ruth challenges the latter, "[*firing up*] what do you mean?" (page 2). Similarly, when criticism is levelled at Ruth due to her social bankruptcy, Dick concedes only that she may be regarded as low, "Geographically - not otherwise" continuing, "She is what I call a lady" (page 51).

Inter-sexual convergence is evident in the relationship between Lavender, Ruth's daughter, and Clement Hale, a solicitor, and the adopted son of a wealthy banker. Clement's attraction to Lavender becomes obvious: not only does he call for the Doctor when he believes her unwell, but also acts as Tutor to the young girl. The divergence of their relationship becomes potential due to objections from Clement's friend, as well as his adopted father, each doubting that a marriage between members of different classes can endure.

The closure of the Wedderburn bank, with the consequent loss of the family fortune, brings the Wedderburn's down to the same economic level as the Rolt's. Having become acquainted with Lavender, Clement's father gives his blessing to the match, as he is now able to recognize, "the only rank which elevates a woman is that which a gentle spirit bestows" (pages 174-5).

Meanwhile, it becomes obvious that when Wedderburn told Clement of an experience of his own, years previously, with a woman from a low social class, he was unwittingly referring to Ruth Rolt (pages 113-14). He initially attempts to convince Clement of the rightness of his decision to

separate from her "She would have been mercilessly cut by the whole county" (page 113).

Having come to recognize by the end of the play that love is more important than either wealth or social prestige, Wedderburn is able to assert of Ruth, "What I have lost now is little compared to what I flung away eighteen years ago - the love of a faithful woman" (pages 178-79).

A friendship is similarly shown to emerge between Minnie Gilfillian, Wedderburn's niece, and Lavender. It is Minnie who tells Clement that he should confide in his father his love for Lavender, regardless of her social position. As Minnie asserts, "say that the girl...has won one staunch friend - Minnie Gilfillian" (page 69). Distraught at the loss of her would-be fiance, Minnie tearfully confides in Lavender. Convinced that she has lost Clement, Lavender is comforted by Minnie.

The Profligate, juxtaposing the inhumane treatment of a servant with philanthropic concern, inter-class divergence with convergence, establishes a standard for inter-class relations, adhered to in Pinero.

Mrs. Stonehay's attitude towards her servant Janet Preece, and her class in general, is summed up in her assertion:

> Men and women are sent into the world
> to help each other. I can help nobody,
> but it is none the less the sole duty of
> others to help me. (page 45)

She instructs that Janet, "Walk on to Fiesole -" (page 44) ignoring the pleas made by others on Janet's behalf, such as "The girl looks painfully delicate" (page 44) and "its a terrible uphill walk...and the sun is very hot at this time of the afternoon" (page 45).

Soon after, the young girl arrives at Leslie's door "begging for a morsel of water" (page 71). Once admitted, she asserts of Mrs. Stonehay "she has threatened to send me away, because she says I am self-willed and won't obey her" (page 72), before falling back in a faint.
Such inhumane treatment is condemned in the play in a number of ways: the seriousness of the consequences for Janet, as she contracts 'brain fever'; the denigration of the character of Mrs. Stonehay, described in the stage directions as *'a pompous looking woman with an arrogant and artificial manner'* (page 42); as well as the comparison which emerges between the treatment Janet received at the hands of Mrs. Stonehay, and the care and concern lavished upon her by Leslie and her brother, Wilfred. Confronted with the fainting Janet, Leslie not only gives her shelter, but along with Wilfred, nurses her until she is well once more. Janet claims of Leslie, "She is the Angel of my new world!" (page 75). Upon learning that the young girl, although unmarried, has had an illicit relationship with a man, Leslie does not condemn Janet, asserting only, "Your weakness and loneliness make it my task to protect you" (page 91).

CHAPTER FIVE

HUMAN NATURE

From a study of Inter-personal Relationships in the plays of Ibsen and Pinero, it soon becomes obvious that there is a close association between Convergence and Divergence, and Human Nature as it is established in the plays.

Characters in Ibsen are essentially motivated by the desire for self-gratification, while characters in Pinero tend to be preoccupied with other people rather than themselves.[1]

Human Nature is manifested in behaviour. Consequently, characters in Ibsen tend to be mercenary, opportunist, unforgiving and uncompromising. Such characters prove both unwilling, and unable, to formulate and subsequently maintain relationships. Conversely, a Pinero character is generally philanthropic, self-sacrificing, loving, kind and forgiving, and therefore both willing and able to participate in inter-personal relations.

The characters analysed in this chapter were selected because they highlight the tendencies noted for each playwright. Such characters are often, but not always, the central character in a play.

Consul Bernick is motivated by the desire for both material and social gratification.

Bernick's advocacy of any issue is conditional upon a satisfactory reward, as evident in his *volte face* both with

reference to the proposed railway and the sea-worthiness of the *Indian Girl*. Bernick was the most vociferous opponent of the initial plan for a Railway, jeopardizing as it did his own interests in the steamship trade. Bernick's advocacy emerges only with a subsequent plan for an inland route with the possibility of a branch line opening up vast lands for industrial development: with the realization of the railway, Bernick expects to become extremely rich. Bernick initially opposed the refloating of the *Indian Girl* with only minimal repairs, asserting that there is "No respect for human life...as soon as profit enters into it" (page 42). However, his opposition evaporates as he is accused of unnecessarily prolonging the length of stay of the unpopular crew. As he asserts, at this time he requires "all the respect and goodwill my fellow citizens can give me" (page 53).

Inter-personal relations for Bernick are similarly functional. His proposal of marriage to Betty was determined by his knowledge of her future inheritance. Bernick's friendship with Johan, Betty's brother, was initiated as a means to gain access to Betty. It is implied that Bernick exploited his sibling relationship with Martha to secure her share of the family fortune for himself.[2] Bernick initiated a partnership with local businessmen, Rummel, Vigeland and Sanstad because of his need for their support to ensure the railway plan is accepted in the town. Bernick's public 'confession' in the final Act can be seen as similarly functional as it appears to result not only in his administrative control over the proposed railway, but also his continued recognition as a 'Pillar of Society'.

Where such a move will provide him with social or material reward, Bernick is willing to sacrifice both friends and family, without hesitation. Bernick spurned his former love, Lona Hessel, because her sister's wealth had a greater attraction, and Mrs. Dorf, because of the scandal following public knowledge of her infidelity. Bernick had, in the past, sacrificed his 'friend' Johan's reputation to save his own, and further, is willing to see Johan die rather than have him live to expose Bernick. To ensure his foreman's allegiance, Bernick blackmails Aune with threatened dismissal, regardless of his years of service. Further, should the *Indian Girl* sink, Bernick determines that Aune shall take the blame.

Bernick is preoccupied with both himself and his own best interests. For example, he demands that Aune's talks to the workers stop, because, to Bernick, they threaten decreased productivity and therefore less profit, while disregarding Aune's objection to the introduction of new machines, accusing him of being discontented (page 52). Bernick regards his marriage to Betty as a success because he has succeeded in crushing her individuality; "she has learnt to accommodate her nature to my way of life" (page 74). That Bernick is unable to comprehend that other people may have different standards from his own is evident when he assumes (mistakenly) that he can buy Johan's silence (page 86).

Bernick is shown to value truth less than appearances, because of the relationship between public respect and admiration, and power. Therefore, Bernick is concerned not that his wife should feel the need to cry, but rather

that no-one should see her crying. Similarly, Bernick allowed it to be publicly accepted that Lona had set her sights on him, while he was innocent of encouraging her (page 35). He also spreads the rumour that Johan was a thief, as well as furthering the belief that Johan and not himself was involved in a covert relationship with a married woman. Bernick's concern to manipulate appearances can be seen as he stage-manages the family in preparation for their 'surprise' by the townspeople in the final Act (page 109).

For Torvald Helmer, gratification is achieved with the satisfaction of his authoritarian tendencies, and relatedly, his twin desire to possess and control. Torvald's authoritarianism is evident as he envisages his wife alternately as his pet and his child, determining a traditional power relationship in which he, as 'owner' and 'parent' dominates. That he desires such a power differential can be seen as he repeatedly refers to his wife's faults - she is a spendthrift, irresponsible, immature, a woman - only to assert "I wouldn't want my pretty little songbird to be the least bit different from what she is now" (page 205). As Nora begins to demonstrate a will of her own in the Second Act, calling for champagne and macaroons, Torvald strives to restrain her, seizing her hands and imploring "let me see you being my own little singing bird again" (page 260).

That Torvald perceives success in terms of power can be seen in his reaction to Krogstad's letter, threatening blackmail, "He can do whatever he likes with me, demand anything he chooses, order me about just as he chooses"..."I'm done for, a miserable failure" (page 276). It is also important to

Torvald that he appear authoritative. For this reason he rejects his wife's attempts to persuade him not to dismiss Krogstad, "if it ever got around that the new manager had been talked over by his wife" (page 242). This can also be seen as the reason for his impassioned objection to Krogstad's assertion of his equality with Torvald at the bank. As his wife expresses independent views, Torvald retorts "you are...out of your mind" (page 281).

When Torvald suspects that his authority is being questioned his immediate response is to attack; as his wife calls him petty, he immediately demonstrates his power over her wishes by sending off to Krogstad a letter, telling him of his dismissal (page 243).

Torvald strives to secure unrivalled control over his wife. To this end, he successfully alienates her from her former friends, under the guise of his love for her, and further, is able to draw satisfaction from the imminent death of Rank, their mutual friend.

With Torvald, relationships are primarily a means to gratify his pride in himself, as can be seen with his wife. As a commodity, "my most treasured possession" (page 267), her value in his mind reflects upon himself, as the owner. Hence, his removal of her shawl to enable Mrs. Linde to admire her (page 267), and his choreography of her entrance and exit from the party in the final Act. He pronounces that Nora should not knit, as the actions involved are unpleasing to the eye (page 268), while forbidding her to eat macaroons to protect her teeth. As a woman, his scorn for her sex further enables him to take pride in himself, as a man (page 203). Torvald is attracted to Rank as his

own happiness is highlighted in the unhappiness of the latter. His dismissal of Krogstad is similarly gratifying, as an assertion of the power inherent in his new position. With Mrs. Linde, Torvald is able to present himself as the powerful yet benevolent employer, assenting to her request for a job, and suggesting his munificence, as he brushes aside her thanks, "Not a bit" (page 221).

Because he is self-willed, Torvald is unable to compromise or to relent, except when it is in his own interests to do so. He refuses to listen to his wife's pleas on behalf of either borrowing money or exercising prudence by not dismissing Krogstad. As a matter of pride, her protests succeed in only strengthening his resolve. A mercenary *volte face* is evident as Torvald decides to appease Krogstad, so that he will not expose Nora's forgery, and is at odds with Torvald's earlier assertion of the need to accept any due punishment.[3]
The extent of Torvald's obsession with himself and his own interests can be seen in his interpretation of Krogstad's blackmail: to Torvald it is he who is damned initially (page 276), and subsequently he who is saved (page 277). The fate of his wife and children are important only in so far as it reflects upon himself.

Pastor Manders is self-opinionated to the extent that views or beliefs alternative to his own, are, by their very existence, erroneous.[4] His determination to protect his reputation from attack in any form leads him to sacrifice the interests of others, as a means to serve his own.

Manders condemns books read by Mrs. Alving although his criticism of their content is based on hearsay (page 359). Manders further presumes to attack the lifestyle of younger

artists with whom he has had little contact (pages 369-70). Manders attacks Mrs. Alving's conduct as both wife and mother without giving her the opportunity to explain the reasons for her behaviour. Challenging her tacit acceptance of incest, Manders is reminiscent of Torvald with Nora, as he questions her sanity "You are far from having the right attitude of mind" (page 384). That Manders is unwilling to believe Mrs. Alving's revelations later in the play, is further evidence of the Pastor's difficulty in accepting that he could possibly err.

Manders' obsession with his reputation is evident in each of, his former relationship with Mrs. Alving, his attitude to insurance and the fire. His rejection of Mrs. Alving once she had left her husband can be seen to have been motivated not by a desire to reconcile her with Alving as he claims, but is embodied in his complaint, "It was extremely inconsiderate of you to seek refuge with *me*" (page 372).[5] Mrs. Alving's desperation and unhappiness were for Manders secondary to his concern for his position as a priest. Manders' view that the orphanage should not be insured is determined by his fear that to do so would suggest a lack of faith on his part, which in turn could lead to public criticism of him. Manders opposes insurance even though he is aware that should the orphanage be destroyed, there are insufficient funds for its replacement. Manders asserts with regard to the fire at the orphanage, given that his culpability seems apparent, "That's just about the worst part of the whole affair" (page 408).

Manders demonstrates that he regards dissemblance for the sake of protecting his reputation as being not simply

acceptable, but admirable, behaviour. Shaking Engstrand's hand as he has offered to take the blame for the fire, Manders offers the praise, "characters like you are rare" (page 410).

Manders' position in the community appears, not only as a source of pride for himself, but one which he is willing to exploit for his own ends. In his reunion with Mrs. Alving he highlights the fact of, "All these blessed committees and things I've been put on" (page 388), while explaining the prompt completion of certain documents in terms of bringing to bear, "a certain amount of pressure" (page 360) upon the authorities.

Peter Stockmann is motivated by a desire to defend the authority inherent in his position as mayor. This megalomania determines, as well as his hostility to persons and ideas which appear to threaten his position, the authoritarian nature of his inter-personal behaviour. Peter claims that he guards his reputation because he needs moral authority to enable him to guide affairs for the general good. However, the play demonstrates that his quest for authority is for selfish, as opposed to selfless, ends. His pride is evident on a number of occasions: in his spirited denial of the assertion that he is an old fogey (page 28); in his false assertion that he, and not the Doctor, was responsible for the idea to build a public baths (page 26); and, also, in his determined attempt to reclaim the Mayoral hat and stick, as symbols of his authority, from the possession of the Doctor (pages 83-4).

The Doctor demonstrates a personal need to convince the public of his infallibility, as necessary to maintaining public support for his position in the community. This can be seen in the issue of the public baths in which the Mayor's hostility to the assertion that the Baths are a health hazard is determined by his desire to avoid personal denigration for having approved the original plan. The mayor is aware that any financial hardship resulting from the closure of the Baths and the cost of renovations, will severely undermine the continuation of his tenure as Mayor. As he asserts to the Doctor, "it is vital to me that your report is withheld" (page 56) and later, "I'm not prepared to compromise" (page 59).
By calculatedly obscuring the issue of public health, while highlighting the considerable economic burden of any renovations, the Mayor is able to win over the majority of the townspeople.

The nature of Peter's inter-personal relations is similarly determined by the Mayor's need to establish the authority of his person. The Mayor encourages the existing power differential between himself and his associates among the townspeople, as he makes no objection to being addressed, "your worship" while maintaining an official reserve in such relationships. To this end, flattery and humility are designed to ingratiate him, as with Aslaken in Act Three whom he addresses as "a wise and sensible man" before persuading him of the perils of the Doctor's position (page 76). This authority is also in evidence in his association with the Doctor where the expression of divergent opinion is arrested by the Mayor's assertion of the Doctor's subordinate position: "as an employee...you

have no right to any independent conviction" (page 59). The Mayor confesses his attempt to establish his authority with a plan to make his brother financially beholden, "I always hoped I might be able to curb you a little if I could help to improve your economic position" (page 56). Jealous of rival authority in any form, the Mayor attempts to undermine the Doctor's relationship with his friends. To this end, he tells Hovstad and Aslaken of his brother's impracticality; that his ability to formulate ideas is wedded to an inability to activate them (page 26).

Hjalmar Ekdal epitomises the selfishness of an Ibsen character, having placed himself and his own interests at the centre of his existence. The source of such behaviour is perhaps explained by Relling, "Hjalmar Ekdal's misfortune is that in his own circle he has always been taken for a shining light" (page 224).

Hjalmar's pride and vanity, which stem from an inflated appreciation of his own attributes, demonstrate his essential narcissism. Hjalmar asserts that contact with himself is education enough for his wife (page 137). He further claims that it is humiliating to see his father treated as an outcast which is different from expressing concern, either that his father has become an outcast, or with regard to the likely effects of such treatment upon the old man (page 139). Vanity is evident as Hjalmar disagrees that he has become stout, he is instead "more of a man" (page 134), similarly, his hair is wavy and <u>not</u> curly (page 158). Hjalmar's preoccupation with his own comfort is manifest in his laziness, as he feigns, for both his wife and daughter that he is working (page 176 ff). His

parasitic dependence means that it is his wife who is, in effect, the household breadwinner. Not only does she manage both the home and the business, but appears to undertake the majority of photographic assignments. As well, Hjalmar encourages his wife and daughter to wait upon him, helping him on and off with his jacket and fetching his flute, for example (pages 157-59). Hjalmar disregards the family's financial straits, except to exploit these as a source for his very vocal self pity. The responsibility for budgeting is assumed by his wife, while it is the family, minus himself, who are forced to make sacrifices. The provision of beer for Hjalmar in Act Two is juxtaposed with Hedvig's confession of her hunger, having missed an evening meal.

Hjalmar appears to satiate, in part, his desire for adulation and respect, with the aid of an embroidering of reality as it concerns himself. Hence, he claims to his family that he was virtually the centre of events and the Werles' dinner party, while the other guests deserved only his scorn (page 157). In fact, so insignificant was Hjalmar that his exit appears to have gone unnoticed (page 143). His claims to be working determinedly upon an important invention, in order to provide for his family's future, serves a similar function.

Hjalmar's projection of himself in the guise of a martyr can be seen as an embroidering of reality to the same end. He claims with melodramatic finesse that if necessary he will work at photography until he drops, forsaking all personal pleasure in the process (page 160).

Hjalmar's tendency to perceive events purely in terms of himself produces considerable scope for his chronic self

pity. Both his father's disgrace, and his daughter's imminent blindness are seen by Hjalmar as his own, and not their, tragedy. The theatricality of his tears in apparent remonstrance for forgetting a promise to his daughter succeeds in winning Hjalmar both demonstrations of love and reassurance from his family (page 161).

Hjalmar's selfishness means that it is impossible for him to feel genuine affection for anyone but himself, as is true for a long line of Ibsen characters. For Hjalmar, his family functions alternately as provider, slave, ego builder and audience. Just as he forgets the promise made to his daughter, he is able to attack his wife for lacking initiative, and to scorn his father's former despair. For this reason, he is able to turn against his family, vowing to leave without hesitation. For this reason also, he in time, returns.

Kroll, like Peter Stockmann, is a megalomaniac of sorts, concerned to establish the hegemony of his own personal ideology or world view.

Concerning the domestic sphere, Kroll laments the passing of his ideal, as a state in which his family, "all thought and acted with one mind" (page 301), that is, his own. This ideal, with regard to his wife's dissent, is evident in an earlier assertion, "there's something rather splendid about ...a woman giving up the best years of her life...for the sake of others" (page 297). In the professional sphere, as a headmaster, Kroll reacts to the adoption of alternative ideas by the boys at the school as a personal attack upon himself, "(they have) banded together in this conspiracy against me" (page 306).

Kroll's reaction to the widespread threat to his ideology is to attack his opponents. Reference is made to "all the hateful things (Kroll) said about the people on the other side...the sneers, the contempt" (page 315). Similarly, Kroll admits, of his wife "she says I domineer the children, bully them" (page 303). The ruthlessness of his pursuit of ideological hegemony is evident in his attack upon his old friend, Rosmer. Kroll asserts, and further demonstrates, an inability to compromise, "Any man who is not with me in these critical matters, I want nothing more to do with. Nor do I owe him any consideration" (page 316). As he tells his 'friend', "we must see if we can render you harmless" (page 316). Kroll proceeds to attack Rosmer in the local newspaper as a Judas-like creature, and "'a traitor to the good cause'" (page 348), in an attempt to break his resolve, besmearing his reputation, discrediting both himself and his ideas. Kroll attempts further to break this resolve more subtley by activating guilt concerning Rosmer's marriage to Beata, and also, by this means, to undermine his present relationship with Rebecca, a woman Kroll believes his antagonist. For Kroll, his own ideology is synonymous with what is right for society as a whole. His determination to defeat an encroachment upon his ideological authority, he understands as "to do my bit as a citizen" against those "corrupting and perverting society." Further, he is able to assert, "I think it is incumbent on every patriotic and right-minded citizen to do the same" (page 302).

Lyngstrand's self-centredness, determined by his double pride in himself, as a man and an artist, is

evident in his preoccupation with his own needs, in both areas.

Lyngstrand, who describes himself as, "a really genuine artist" (page 85), perceives marriage for a woman as a process in which she "becomes more and more like her husband" (page 86). To Lyngstrand it is possible for an artist to live for his art alone even though he is married. Conversely, referring to the wife of an artist, he asserts, "She must also live for his art" (page 87), her role being to help him with his creation by "smoothing his path" (page 87). His exploitative selfishness can be seen in his assertion:

> to know that somewhere in the world
> there is a lovely young woman sitting
> and silently dreaming about you...
> I think it must be so...so...well,
> I don't really know what to call it. (page 117)

Hedda Gabler is a character who judges her own behaviour by the standard of personal satisfaction. Upon returning from her honeymoon, and being greeted by Tesman's Aunt, Hedda refuses Julle a place in the cab, preferring to travel with her luggage in its entirety. Hedda likewise refuses to demonstrate affection for the old woman, as she tells her husband, "I just couldn't" (page 184). As is her intention, Hedda only narrowly misses Brack while firing her pistols. Hedda feigns the belief that a hat belonging to Julle belongs to the maid, knowing that Julle would be both hurt and ashamed. Because of her self-obsession, Hedda is uninterested in either her husband's joy at being reunited with a pair of slippers (page 181), the fact that he may lose out on the professorship (page 200) and even his Aunt Rina's death, conceding

only that it was to be expected (page 239).

True satisfaction is only possible for Hedda with the imposition of her will, understood in terms of the exercise of her control, over others.

In her relations with her husband, Hedda asserts, and subsequently receives, the satisfaction of her demands regardless of his very real concern for their financial predicament. The Tesmans undertake a lengthy honeymoon because, as Tesman asserts "Hedda had to have that trip,... I couldn't do less" (page 177). Defending the purchase of their new home, Tesman claims, "I couldn't possibly have expected her to put up with a genteel suburb" (page 197). Hedda's assumption of control over Thea is represented visually as she pinches her to keep her silent (page 229), before manhandling her to force her to remain in Act Three (page 231).

Hedda's quest for control over Ejlert, "I want to feel that I control a human destiny" (page 230), can be seen as motivated, in part, by her jealousy of Thea's control over him. This jealousy is evident in Act Two as Hedda, concealing an involuntary sneer, comments to Thea, "And so you've reclaimed the prodigal...as they say" (page 194). Hedda endeavours to transform Ejlert's behaviour to match her own designs for him, persuading Ejlert to drink an alcoholic punch (page 227), as well as to join a bachelor party (page 229), initially against his wishes. Hedda anticipates that Ejlert will project himself as a Dionysus-type figure, with "vine leaves in his hair" (page 231).

As a measure of the importance of the assertion of her will, it is the progressive loss of this control over others which eventually breaks Hedda. Hedda, rising slowly

and tiredly in Act One, is forced to accept that she will not receive either the saddle horse or the footman, or indulge in a full social life, as Tesman had formerly promised (page 201). In the final Act, Tesman and Thea, locked together in an attempt to resurrect Ejlert's manuscript, are oblivious to Hedda's presence. Hedda's wish that Ejlert appear with vine leaves in his hair is defeated as Tesman recounts his drunken, abusive behaviour on the night of Brack's party (page 237). Hedda subsequently encourages Ejlert in suicide, telling him "let it happen... beautifully" Ipage 249). Conversely, Ejlert shoots himself in the abdomen. Learning of this, Hedda, assuming an expression of revulsion, laments "everything I touch seems destined to turn into something mean and farcical" (page 263).

Judge Brack emerges in the Third Act as a kindred spirit and therefore a threat to Hedda's predominance thus far. His determination to remove Ejlert as a rival for Hedda's attentions leads him to assert "I'll fight for that end... with every means at my disposal" (page 243), and causing Hedda's smile to fade. In the final Act, Brack succeeds in gaining control over Hedda with the knowledge of her role in Ejlert's death. As he tells her, "there is nothing to fear so long as I keep silent" (page 266). Hedda's inability to acquiesce in the loss of her freedom, "Subject to your will and your demands...That's a thought I'll never endure! Never" (page 266) means that her subsequent suicide can be interpreted as an attempt to resist such control. For Hedda, a life in which self-gratification is challenged, successfully, is a life not worth living.

Kate Verity's aim is neither wealth nor prestige, but simply to be good: "I prayed to God to make me good all my life" (page 58).

Kate's inter-personal relations are established upon a selfless basis, and dominated by her love, charity, loyalty, kindness and concern. To Kate, an individual has an inherent worth, regardless of either social or material position. She marries Eric for love, even though he is branded an idler, and will be made a pauper should his mother learn of their marriage. Kate offers to share all her money with him, while refusing to allow him to "pinch and struggle" for her (page 76).

Confronted with Felicity, the daughter of her shepherd, unhappy at home, Kate offers her as well as her love, a home and a living with her.

Christiana, Kate's maid, asserts of Kate, "(She) gives me the same living that goes to the best table and as soft a pillow as lies on the best bed" (page 11).

Kate's loyalty is practiced even at the risk of damaging her own reputation and position. Concerning Eric, with whom it is believed she is having an illicit relationship, she asserts, to the Pastor, "neither you nor my Bishop could shut my doors upon the man I love" (page 79).

Threatened with blackmail by Christiana, as the price for continuing her friendship with Felicity, Kate retorts "I promise to be a friend to little Felicity as long as she loves me and clings to me. Say the worst you can" (page 74).

Earlier in the play Kate had defended Christiana's tardiness in singing hymns, to the Pastor "you start them in such a

high key, Pastor" (page 19).

The importance of people for Kate is evident in her demonstrativeness as she kisses the anonymous child who hands her flowers at the festival (page 69); nurses the child of a local shopkeeper (page 72); as well as frequently kissing and touching Felicity.[6] Kate's concern for others can be seen as she sends a basket of food to a woman unknown to her, who is a stranger to the area and unwell (page 19). Kate also instructs the Doctor be sent to an employee on the estate now old and infirm (page 13).
Meeting the Pastor Dormer after many years, Kate immediately sets about mending a hole in his jacket (page 21).

Kate's understanding of people can be seen as she quickly perceives the Pastor's misogyny to have resulted from a personal experience (page 21); her kindness as she thanks him for bringing her news that although necessary can only bring her pain (page 54). Kate is also quick to perceive Felicity's upset, having been spurned by her love, comforting the young girl with words and the physical demonstration of affection (page 65).

Kate's charity is evident in the frequency with which she gives to others. Each visitor who calls, regardless of their status, is offered a drink before leaving. Kate is also patron of the annual Harvest Festival, donating the necessary sustenance, as well as her lands, and her time, for the day. Her absence of pride occurs in her readiness to forgive - Gunnion for tapping the beer meant for the Festival; Gilbert for doubting her; as well as the late-comers to the Festival. Kate's humble nature is evident as she tells the townspeople, "You are kinder to me than I deserve" (page 70), while at the end of the play she kneels

to the Pastor for his forgiveness (page 81).
Kate's unacquisitiveness is evident in the consistently low rents imposed upon her tennants, regardless of the unprofitability of her estate (page 43), and also as she asserts to her husband that their earlier quarrelling was due to "wrangling about miserable money" (page 76).

Finally, the depth of Kate's selflessness is such that she prefers to turn her attention outward to those around her, relegating to the background of her consciousness her own fear and suffering.

Joslyn Hammersmith sacrifices wealth and compromises his reputation without hesitation in order to gain the hand of the woman he loves. Of Florence, a woman of inconsequential wealth and birth, in contrast to his own double prosperity, Joslyn humbly asserts, "I could wish Florence a better husband, but I couldn't wish myself a better wife" (page 26). Joslyn agrees to accept the liability for the welfare of her apparent father, Walkinshaw, in his declining years, as the price for her hand (page 26).
In the meantime, however, Joslyn allows himself to be exploited, lending Walkinshaw money initially, and subsequently providing him with a regular allowance to support his lavish lifestyle, as well as lodgings and an entry into high society. Joslyn objects only when it becomes obvious that Walkinshaw means similarly to exploit Joslyn's own mother. In loyalty to her, Joslyn asserts, "I...cannot sacrifice one woman for another" (page 48).

Joslyn's selflessness and his concern for others is highlighted in his friendship with Mable, whom he met on a boat and consequently gives his London address. Joslyn becomes emotionally involved in Mable's search for his

missing daughter, as with his hand on Mable's shoulder he asserts, "I hope from the bottom of my heart you'll be successful" (page 15). Joslyn's trust in his fellow man can be seen as he learns that Mable's brother had mysteriously stopped writing, as he assumes this to be because the latter had died, and not for malicious reasons. By his very nature unable to contemplate revenge, or even prolonged resentment, Joslyn offers Walkinshaw his forgiveness in the final Act (page 79).

As with Kate and Joslyn before him, Aeneas Posket founds relationships on the basis of individual worth. Posket marries Agatha for love, evident in his blindly accepting responsibility for her son, Cis, and also in his decision to marry without consulting friends or relatives. As Agatha recalls, Posket declared "I love you for yourself alone" (page 15).

Posket's concern for his fellow man is evident in his philanthropy. Regarding his staff, he confesses, "everybody in my employ...has been brought to my notice through the unhappy medium of the Police Court" (page 10). Posket's unacquisitiveness as well as his instinctive assistance of others can be seen in his unconcern at his losses to Cis at cards (page 16), and as he gives the boy money to repay his debts (page 23). Similarly, Posket is unable to refuse Cis's plea that he accompany him to the Hôtel des Princes even though Posket does so against his better judgement. Posket's unconcern for his own comfort, as opposed to that of another, is comically represented as both he and Cis jump from a window to escape the Police, while Posket manages to cushion Cis's fall with his own

body, "I felt it was my duty" he explains (page 51).

Posket's impulse to forgiveness is evident both with his wife and Cis. In the final Act, Posket forgives Agatha for her lies concerning the age of her son, as well as her covert liaison with Lukyn. Posket blesses the marriage of Cis although he had caused Posket much anguish in the course of the play.

Reverend Noel Brice can be seen to embody the Pinero tradition of self-sacrifice in the service of others, willingly accepting poverty as the wages of his labour. Brice, *'a pale, care-worn looking young man'* lives in a *'dull, sombre lodging house in the East End of London'*. As Act Two opens, Brice is struggling to write his sermons with a bandaged wrist, the injury incurred as he tried to break up a drunken riot. Noel, badly in need of respite, both physical and emotional, passes up the opportunity of a holiday, partly because of the attitude of the Rector's wife, who is "very angry at the idea of my wanting a rest" (page 60). Instead, faced with two sermons and an article to write, as well as parish duties to attend to, Brice only pushes himself harder, "come Brice...you must put on the steam" (page 73).

Although *'awfully poor, driven like a slave, worked to death'* (pages 62-3), Brice willingly assumes the added burden of his deceased brother's children, numbering four.[7] It is to support these children, as well as for the people of his Parish, and not for himself, that Brice labours. Such loyalty is similarly evident in his relationship with Tom Clark, upon whom he settles as well as his friendship, subsequently stating, "friend - the dearest name a man can

give," (page 62), a room in the lodging house in which he lives.

Brice, as a man of staunch principles, would rather endure the daily struggle which is life than compromise these, as he demonstrates when he refuses to consider the vacant position of warden in a home for decayed jockeys, " even for fresh air and three hundred pounds, one doesn't sell one's convictions" (page 76).

It is Brice's allegi nce to his personal code of honour which motivates him to resign his position as Reverend, rather than accept the slandering of the companion to his niece, by the wife of the Rector, stating "your money has mildewed the bread with which I feed the dear ones who are dependant on me long enough," (page 89).

Brice is selfless also in love. Having fallen for a woman whom he does not realize to be married, Brice is able to congratulate her husband on his excellent choice, "The only great mistake possible in proposing marriage is to select an unworthy object. I fell into no such error" (page 163).

Forgiveness also comes easy to one such as Brice, as he demonstrates when he excuses Mrs. Jermyn for having tricked him into signing a letter worded by herself, as "evidence of an impulsive lady's compassion and tender heartedness towards a very poor man" (page 160).

Georgina Tidman, arriving at St. Marvells widowed and recently declared bankrupt, remains throughout the play jovial, friendly and affectionate. In doing so, she proves her allegi nce to Kate Verity, and Pinero characters in general, who are able to transcend their own personal problems. Georgina had already through her marriage to

a gentleman jockey and her involvement with the world of horse racing proven herself impervious to social stigmatization, valuing more highly an allegiance to her own personal standard for living.

Her loyalty appears first with her husband, then Dandy Dick, and later her brother.
With the death of her husband, Georgina assumed the responsibility for the business, continuing where he had left off. Witnessing the subsequent auction of horses and stock, she was unable to part with Dandy Dick, buying back a half share in the horse. As she confesses, "I'm a doating mother to my share of Dandy" (page 89). Reunited with her brother, Georgina, without words, is able to demonstrate her forgiveness for his alienation from her as a consequence of her marriage, agreeing to live with his family, and affectionately greeting his daughter and himself (page 30).

Georgina's concern for those around her is made obvious with her tangible assistance to those who demonstrate a need. Learning that both her nieces and her brother are short of money, she provides them with a tip for the races (page 76), unconcerned that additional betting can only lower the odds, and therefore, her own expected return. Advice is matched by action as Georgina secures the return of her brother from police custody, without a thought for the likely penalty should she be discovered; and later lends him the one thousand pounds he needs. Learning that the hotel where her friend is staying has been burnt, Georgina secures Sir Tristram a bed at the Deanery.

Georgina's attitude to love matches the selflessness and unacquisitiveness of her attitude to life, as she declares to Sir Tristram, accepting his proposal, "love is founded on mutual esteem" (page 147).

Clement Hale demonstrates a willingness to sacrifice both social prestige and material wealth when forced to choose between either of these and a person of whom he is fond. Clement chooses to live with Dick Phenyl, a drunken, washed-up lawyer because he believes in the latter's essential worth:

> the good burns clearer and brighter
> in his slovenly person than many who
> have had luck and love and luxury in
> their lives - which Dick hasn't. (page 11)

Clement's reputation, and the prestige attendant upon his previous address both suffer as a consequence, "Mr. 'Ale used to be such a swell, as the sayin' goes, over in Pear Tree Court, and then...to come 'ere... - it's bewilderin'" (page 3). Clement consistently disregards such expressions of disapproval for their friendship, even when uttered by his class-conscious Aunt (page 84).

As well as his friendship, Clement gives Dick endless encouragement to rehabilitate his lifestyle, repeatedly forgiving his lapses, shaking his hand and accepting his "word of honour" not to drink, although acknowledging "it's always the last time, Dick" (page 20). Such is Clement's loyalty to his friend that he genuinely appears unsurprised when Dick eventually mends his ways, "what did I always say Dick was? (page 178).

Clement chooses the daughter of his housekeeper as his future wife, regardless of her social and material

poverty. Clement's unacquisitiveness is evident as he tells Lavender, "I'll be poor with you" (page 41), while his disregard for social value can be seen in his reaction to his father's caution that Lavender would be snubbed by society in the local county, "confound the whole county!" (page 114). Challenging Lavender's assertion that she is not a Lady, Clement retorts "My dear Princess" (page 40). The genuineness of his love for Lavender, apparent in his attentiveness, is never in doubt. When her mother sends her away, Clement finds life unendurable. When asked by his father to give Lavender up, conscious that to offend the man is to threaten his own source of income, Clement is true to his love "I - I can't, Father" (page 114).

Clement, further, supports the philanthropic work of Dr. Delaney, who provides nurses for the sick, rich and poor alike, as he tells the Doctor, "I wish more of us were like you" (page 32).
The kindness, such as he lavishes upon Lavender and Dick, determines also his assertion that when they are married, Lavender's mother will never have to work again (page 43).

The reiteration of 'simple' in the stage directions describing the young Sylvia Vivash's appearance indicates the unsullied nature of her character. That her nature and manner are equally pleasant is suggested in the uniformity of opinion of her. Her mother's pet name for her is Gossamer, because "she is so light and bright and merry" (page 39), while her fiance asserts of Sylvia "(She is) sweet and gentle with a voice that has the meaning of Truth in it" (page 84). Her chaperone while in Europe confesses that everyone was smitten with her, "from a Charing Cross Porter to the Pope" (page 47).

Sylvia's genuine affection for her mother is testimony to her ability to love. There are repeated occasions in which Sylvia runs on stage to greet Lady Vivash; as well, she demonstrates a very real concern when she believes her mother may be ill (page 117). Sylvia's capacity for selflessness is further evident as she shows herself prepared to break with the man she loves for the sake of her mother's happiness, Lady Vivash having formerly loved the same man. Learning the truth, Sylvia asks her mother's forgiveness, "it is I who have brought trouble on you" and concludes, "I was selfish ever to think of leaving you" (page 140).

The absence of pride in Sylvia's character can be seen in her readiness to ask for forgiveness, from Lady Vivash and Rhoda also. Sylvia apologizes to the young girl for having appeared horrified that Rhoda could possibly consider marrying the horrendous Mr. Bargus, MP (page 80).

That Sylvia is attracted to the substance of character rather than to social superficialities is evident in her relations with the frumpish Rhoda, ashamed that people are staring at her due to the inappropriateness of her dress for a party. Ignoring such cruelty, Sylvia befriends the young girl. Although her engagement made her very happy, Sylvia does not jealously guard such happiness, instead wishing it upon others, such as Rhoda. As she tells the young girl, "I do hope that you'll be engaged soon" (page 79).

Dunstan Renshaw is an example of a character redeemed in the course of a play, having formerly lived for the gratification of his own lust and pleasures, without a care for his victims.

It is through experiencing true love that Dunstan comes to repent, self-gratification being replaced by selflessness.

The strength of his desire to atone for the past can be seen in his enthusiasm for philanthropy. As his wife asserts, "he is good to everybody, good to everybody," continuing, "Directly we came here he sought out all the poor; in a few days they have learnt to bless his name" (page 52). Compelled to leave the area for a few days he stresses to his wife, "you'll not forget the lame girl... or Pietro's old mother,"..."and double the allowance to those children we helped yesterday" (page 61).

Regarding Janet Preece, a young woman ruined in his quest for pleasure, Dunstan asserts "I will do all in my power to atone" and also, "I won't die till I've made amends" (page 68).

Dunstan having married the wealthy schoolgirl Leslie Brundel for seemingly mercenary reasons, comes to love her selflessly, asserting "the companionship of this pure woman is a revelation of life to me!" (page 67). As Leslie tells an old friend, "I fear to have a wish because I know he cannot rest until it is gratified," and continues, "if I look here, or there, his dear eyes imitate mine; if I rise he starts up; if I walk on he follows me" (page 51). It is the spurning of his love by Leslie as she learns the truth concerning his past that causes him to *'look broken and walk feebly'* (page 118), and subsequently to poison himself, because "I could not live away from her" (page 122).

CHAPTER SIX

THE COLLECTIVE VERSUS THE INDIVIDUAL

The analysis of Human Nature in Ibsen and Pinero provides only one explanation for the incidence of either Divergence or Convergence in their plays.
A further explanation can be seen to centre upon the playwrights' own perception of inter-personal relationships. This attitude, while not directly apparent, can be understood from an examination of the Collective as opposed to the Individual in the plays of each.[1]
That the Collective is presented as malign in Ibsen, can be seen to relate to the spirit of anti-convergence which predominates in his work. Convergence in Pinero can be explained by the association of the Collective with personal happiness, security and fulfilment.

In Ibsen, the Collective is discredited, in part, by means of the presentation of its representatives in the plays.

Manders is presented as a hypocritical figure, a Pastor who fails to demonstrate Christian ideals while actively espousing these to others.[2] As well, the Pastor's position of power in the Christian Church is made to appear as personal aggrandizement rather than service.
Manders is proud, self-serving, disloyal and unforgiving,[3] and also demonstrates a distinct lack of faith. It is pragmatics rather than faith which is responsible for his

opposition to insurance. Similarly, believing himself to be innocent of starting the fire, Manders relies on Engstrand rather than his God to rescue him, as he grasps at Engstrand's offer to assume the blame (page 410). Because it is the appearance rather than the nature of his actions which causes Manders concern, the Pastor appears as a man without a conscience in the Christian sense. The Pastor is also established in the play as an astute businessman who easily slips into the vocabulary of the financial world, as he refers to "(a) deed of conveyance," an "authorization for the bequest," and "interest at four per cent at six months notice" (pages 360-61).

Rorlund, although a schoolteacher by profession, can also be seen as a representative of organized Christianity. As Lona retorts to the young man's assertion that he is not a Pastor, "You will be in time, sure enough" (page 47).

Rorlund appears essentially as a comic figure: obtuse, ingenuous and naive, while occasionally revealing an un-Christian prejudice and selfishness. Rorlund's interpretation of Bernick's home as a place "where peace and harmony prevail" (page 27) is ludicrous given the present, and subsequent, rifts which occur. Similarly, in the final Act, Rorlund refers to Bernick's "peaceful fireside" (page 118), unaware that Olaf has run away. Favouring the Consul's initial opposition to the plan for a railway, the young man refers to him as being "an instrument in the hand of a higher power" (page 25). Rorlund reiterates his belief that corruption is rife in the outside world while failing to recognize the already corrupt nature of his own town. Rorlund's essential uncharitability is evident in his denunciation of the visiting American crew as being

"the scum of humanity," (page 25), while he angrily reacts to their peaceful procession through the town "there's really every justification for the police to intervene" (page 45).

Although professing to Dina his affection for her, Rorlund is unwilling to make a public announcement due to his concern for his own reputation, "If only I could be sure that my motives would not be misinterpreted" (page 38).

As Editor of The Peoples Herald Hovstad initially proclaims "the Truth must come first," (page 47), his personal ideal being "to stand firm, like a man with confidence in himself," (page 51), while Ibsen exposes the readiness of the Editor to relinquish these self-proclaimed ideals. Hovstad is willing to print a story with a pseudo-Christian message, although he is an atheist, purely for the purpose of increasing the paper's readership (page 72). His hypocrisy is further evident in his deferential greeting of the Mayor (page 75) whom he had claimed to be his enemy, as well as his patronage of the printer, Aslaken, whom he attacks in private, because no one else would give him credit. Withdrawing his support of the Doctor for reasons of self-interest, Hovstad agrees with Aslaken, of the duty of an Editor, "Is it not to work in harmony with his readers?" (page 92).

Mortensgaard and Kroll as newspaper Editors are exposed as being duplicitous and partisan.

Mortensgaard intends to present Rosmer as a Christian supporter of the party backing the newspaper, although he knows Rosmer to have renounced his faith. His aim is to win "a strong moral backing" both for the newspaper and the party (page 331). Further, Mortensgaard

is revealed to include in his newspaper only that which he believes the public needs to know (page 332).

Kroll, in turn, wants to present Rosmer to the public as the Editor of his newspaper, although this is untrue, because his own supporters "cannot count on much of a circulation...if we use our own names" (page 304).

Brack, a Judge, is revealed to be debauched, self-serving and ruthless. As a bachelor, Brack favours a triangular relationship, alienating the affections of the wives of his so-called friends (page 207).
Giving the impression that he is Tesman's friend, while making fun of him in private, Brack seeks to develop a covert relationship with Hedda. To this end, he attempts in the final Act to blackmail Tesman's wife. Brack's debauchery is further suggested in the nature of his bachelor party, which he guarantees to be 'lively', and which degenerates into 'an orgy' as his drunken guests adjourn to the 'Salon' of Madame Diana.

The self-serving nature of local authorities is exposed in Ghosts as Manders asserts "all the influential people...have been talking about the orphanage...people are hoping it will help...towards reducing the burden on the rates" (pages 362-3).

The Chamberlains present at Werle's dinner party are labelled in the text according to their physical characteristics, suggesting their universality. These 'people from the palace' are sensuously obsessed, interrupting the praise of the meal and the wine only to flirt with Mrs. Sorby, or to suggest possible ways to amuse themselves (pages 133-143 passim).

They further appear childlike in their desire for instant gratification, developing each idea or piece of wit enthusiastically only to drop it a moment after in favour of another.

Political representatives in Ibsen fare no better, as in An Enemy of the People, where political issues are judged on the basis of self-interest. It is a thirst for power which motivates Hovstad, a People's Leader, to support the Doctor against the town's officials, and subsequently, a desire to protect and maintain what power he already has which causes him to turn on the Doctor in favour of the Mayor.

Aslaken, a representative of the town's ratepayers is blatantly mercenary, announcing "I...am in favour of popular self-government...as long as it doesn't fall too heavily on the ratepayers" (page 91). He initially supports the Doctor in his quest to upgrade the Baths, because the tradespeople he represents are depending on the Baths for their livelihood.
Aslaken withdraws that support immediately he learns the likely cost of repairs is to be borne by taxpayers, such as himself.

Collective leadership and control is presented as malign, as the plays demonstrate that "the most dangerous enemies of truth and freedom are the majority."[4]
In Ibsen, the Collective sacrifices the Truth for mercenary and pragmatic reasons, or simply due to the obtuse nature of its members - that is, an inability to even recognize the Truth. Relatedly, a Collective tends to be intellectually reactionary, resisting any amendment to accepted ideas and

beliefs. Freedom tends to be overwhelmed as Collectives seek to perpetuate themselves, imposing a conformity of values, behaviour and belief upon its members.[5] Critics are assimilated where possible, and otherwise broken.

An Enemy of the People demonstrates the opposition existing in Ibsen, between Truth on the one hand, and the Collective on the other.

In this play, the central truth, that the new public baths are a health hazard, is perceived by an individual, Doctor Stockmann. The play demonstrates that the more people that are informed, the more the Truth is qualified and undermined. At a meeting containing a cross-section of the local community, the Truth is denounced as a lie.

In Act One, Doctor Stockmann reveals the Truth. In subsequent Acts, it is the consequences of the revelation, rather than its content, which is considered important by each Collective.

In Act Two, the town's Mayor, representing the Bath's committee agrees to accept the Doctor's report only in part, while suppressing its release publicly.

In Act Three, as he attempts to dissuade the representatives of the compact majority and the Press from supporting the Doctor, the Mayor asserts that his claims are mere speculation. Persuaded that any repairs to the Baths would be costly, both Hovstad and Aslaken shift their allegiance from the Doctor to the Mayor. At the public meeting in Act Four, the majority chooses to accept the Mayor's explanation because it profits the town to do so. Unconcerned for the Truth, the majority attempts to silence the Doctor.

The vulnerability of the Truth inthe face of the Collective can be seen as certain anonymous citizens agree that the Doctor has of course erred in his allegations simply because the property-owners, the press and the working men are all against him (page 87).

In Pillars of Society the local community accepts without question Rorlund's assertions concerning the moral inadequacy of the 'bigger nations'. As Rorlund tells them, "these nations are nothing but whited sepulchres" (page 25). His powers of perception are undermined as he adds, "they calculate in human life as they do capital assets" continuing "Look at our admirable ship owners! Name me a single one, who, for a miserable profit, would think of sacrificing human life" (page 97). Such complacency is exposed as short-sighted and naive, given the exposure to the audience of Bernick's plan for the wreck of the *Indian Girl*.
Lies propagated by the local businessmen in opposition to a proposed railway, in terms of its expected corrupting influence, are accepted and believed. Later in the play, the community accepts as the truth further lies which Bernick and his associates propagate, this time in favour of the railway, in terms of the selfless dedication of the leading businessmen in the service of the town (page 25).

The complacent insularity and parochialism currently in vogue, and summed up by Rorlund "the thing that counts is to keep society pure...to keep at bay all these new fangled things that an impatient age wants to force upon us," (page 25) produce an instinctive hostility toward non-members, such as Lona Hessel.
Returning from the United States, the individualistic Lona,

a non-conformist in behaviour and manner, is ostracised from the local community, being regarded as a "certain element" (page 119). Ibsen chooses to make this character the only truly perceptive person in the play, as it is she who perceives the Truth: "What does count here? Lies and sham...nothing else" (page 111).

The Truth is shown to be irrelevant to Pastor Manders as he attacks the nature of Mrs. Alving's reading in terms of whether "that sort of thing makes you feel any better, or any happier" (page 359). So obviously out of touch with contemporary thought, the Pastor can only speculate as to whether such ideas are popular, "surely not in this country? Not here?" (page 359). Similarly, Manders is able to dismiss out of hand Mrs. Alving's suggestion that incest may be commonplace as "unheard of" (page 383).

Ibsen makes Mrs. Alving a sympathetic and perceptive character, whose understanding of Ghosts as being "all kinds of old defunct theories, all sorts of old defunct beliefs" (page 384) is central to understanding the play. Representing the Church, Manders is presented by Ibsen as both unwilling and unable to open either his mind, or his ears, to what she has to say.

By such means as suppression, coercion and intimidation, the Collective denies the freedom of speech to Doctor Stockmann.

In contrast to the vigilante mentality of the mob, the Doctor is presented sympathetically as an individual and a victim, believing sincerely in his duty to make public an horrendous truth and seemingly thwarted at every turn: the Mayor, and Chairman ofthe Baths committee initially denies him the right to speak (page 59). In defiance of this order, the

Doctor resorts to the self-professed 'free press' only to be denied once more, the editor claiming to be at the mercy of the opinions of his readers (page 83). The printer refuses to print the Doctor's report privately, adding "you'll not get anybody in town to print it" (page 84). Such proves to be the case. In desperation, the Doctor decides upon a street march before being told, "you'll not get a single man in the whole town to go with you" (page 85). His plan to hire a hall for a public meeting is similarly thwarted (page 88). Finally, securing a room for a meeting the Doctor is subjected to constant heckling and taunts from the angry crowd, while it is decided that he not be allowed to talk on the matter of the Baths (page 91). After speaking only on related topics, the Doctor and his family are forced to retreat from the howling mob (page 105).

In the final Act, the town, by means of ostracism and physical attack, attempts to drive the Doctor out. In a further attempt to enforce his reassimilation into the Collective, the town directs its intimidation at the Doctor's family and friends.

Relatedly, the local community in Pillars of Society denies its citizens the freedom to be individuals, instead imposing a rigid conformity of behaviour and belief. Individuality is subjected to unified attack, in the form of alienation and intimidation. Lona, as an individualist remembers "all the ridicule they showered upon me... the sniggers at what they used to call my eccentricities," such as cutting her hair and wearing boots in the rain (page 72). The attack upon her character continued even

after she had left, in the form of gossip, establishing her as "a dark spot in the sunlight of the Bernick's lives" (page 34). Upon her return, people are too busy to speak to her, while her own cousin crosses the road to avoid her.

Like the Doctor, Lona is presented as an undeserving victim, who worked selflessly for the sake of Johan in the United States, nursing him when he was ill, and was cruelly spurned by Bernick, who rose to be a leading citizen in the town.[6]

In Ghosts the force of contemporary Christian teaching convinced Mrs. Alving that she was not free to abandon either her marriage or her husband. Such a Collective denial of individual freedom is attacked in this play, as the horrific consequences of Mrs. Alving's return, for the entire family, are exposed.

Collectives in Ibsen are shown to advocate moral absolutes as guides for behaviour and belief. In opposition to this, the plays demonstrate both the moral flux of the advocates as well as the necessarily evolving and fickle nature of any such code.

Pastor Manders has already been established as a Christian in name only, a transgressor in terms of his own professed code for living.

Kroll is also an advocate of Christianity asserting his antipathy for "any kind of morality that is not rooted in the faith of the Church" (page 327). Conversely, his own un-Christian behaviour is made apparent in the merciless nature of his political campaign.

Judge Brack is shown to abandon Lovborg after his party because of the scandal he expects to follow from the latter's

exploits, and his own unwillingness to appear to condone such behaviour. While Ejlert in causing the disturbance at Madame Diana's believed that he had sufficient cause,[7] Brack in attempting to foster an extramarital relationship with Hedda, and presumably others, demonstrates a singularly salacious motivation.

The fickle nature of any moral code is made obvious in Pillars of Society. The past obsession of the local community with 'pleasure-seeking' in terms of Societies for drama, music and dance, was at that time acceptable. Such pleasure-seeking is shown in Act One to have been supplanted by virtual puritanism, in which the leading citizens actively seek to disengage themselves from their past.

Collectives are often presented by Ibsen as inadequate because they are patriarchal, and therefore unaware of, and unreceptive to, the unique needs and desires of women in the plays.

In Pillars of Society women are shown to be excluded from the masculine world of business, a feature actively encouraged by the menfolk.
Concerning the railway, Bernick is shown as receptive to questions from other males such as Hilmar and Rorlund while dismissing similar questions from his wife, "My dear Betty, what interest can this possibly have for you" (page 39). At this point, Bernick turns his back on her and continues talking with the other men present. Reacting to his wife's request "you must come out here and tell us...", Bernick retorts, "my dear Betty, its not a thing for ladies to worry their heads about" (page 39).

Lona establishes the extent to which Bernick has seen Male and Female as justifiably occupying separate spheres in his relationship with his wife, "you never shared your interests with her...you've never been open and frank with her in any of your dealings" (page 111).

In A Doll's House, the law is exposed as being a masculine construct which fails to accommodate feminine thought, feeling and behaviour. As Krogstad asserts, "The law takes no account of motives." Nora retorts, "then they must be very bad laws" (page 229).
Nora believed her forgery to be a worthy action, as she brags to Mrs. Linde "I too have something to be proud and happy about. I was the one who saved Torvald's life" (page 213). Nora is shown as unable to accept that in the eyes of the law she is a criminal, "Isn't a daughter entitled to try to save her father from worry and anxiety on his deathbed? Isn't a wife entitled to save her husband's life?" (page 229). Nora instead continues to believe that Krogstad is mistaken, "I might not know very much about the law,...but...it must say somewhere that things like this are allowed" (page 229).
Nora, like other Ibsen characters, is presented as a victim of Collective Strength. Her decision to forge her father's signature is presented as having been her last hope for saving her husband. The burden of the loan repayment is further shown to have been Nora's alone, involving her in both sacrifice and worry.
The unfairness of patriarchal assumptions concerning female corruption are also exposed, and criticised, by Ibsen.

As Torvald asserts, "Practically all juvenile delinquents come from homes where the mother is dishonest," (page 233), adding "it's generally traceable to the mothers." Conversely, the audience is encouraged to respect each of the women in the play: Nora, because she has suffered selflessly, and Mrs. Linde because she married in order to give her brothers and her mother a secure future.

In Ghosts, the double standards advocated by the Church are exposed in such a way that they appear unjustified. As Mrs. Alving refers to her husband as having been a fallen man, Manders expresses both opposition to, and surprise at, the idea, "good heavens! What are you talking about? A fallen man!" (page 381).

Society, being all inclusive, is the ultimate Collective. As with any Collective in Ibsen, Society demands conformity of behaviour and belief. Socially established norms for female behaviour anathematize Hedda's power to resist, her 'lust for life'. Following the traditional pattern of marriage and subsequent pregnancy, Hedda is reduced to a voyeur. The inadequacy of sexual 'blue-printing' is highlighted in Hedda's dissatisfaction, not only with the domestic sphere, but her life in general, as she confesses to Brack, "I'm bored do you hear!" (page 212).

Hedda recognizes the power of society, to expose abnormal behaviour and belief and later to punish. She is also aware that to resist one must have courage. For this reason, Hedda admires Ejlert, "He had the courage to do...what had to be done" (page 260). Terrified of becoming Society's prey, Hedda consequently fears scandal, and it is this which finally breaks her.

Hedda conceives suicide to be her only means of escape; confronted with the threat of stigmatization and potential ostracism, her thoughts are focussed upon "all...of them" (page 267). Suicide in the case of Hedda is further an affirmation of her own vulnerability in competition with Collective pressure, as she asserts "I shall be silent in future" (page 267).

Bernick is similarly presented as unable to resist the dictates of Society, suffering perpetual frustration and a sense of entrapment as a consequence. As he comes to realize:

> If I wanted to be one step in advance of the current views and opinions of the day, that would have put paid to any power I have. Those of us who count as Pillars of Society...We are society's tools, nothing more nor less. (page 110)

In A Doll's House Nora recognizes that in leaving her husband and children, society becomes her antagonist: "I must try to discover who is right, society or me" (page 283). It is obvious that the real struggle will take place following the close of the play, as Nora, alone, without either a home or the means to survive financially, attempts to rebuild her life. Rather than her success, it is more likely that society will eventually crush Nora, just as it did Hedda.

In Ibsen, inter-personal relationships can be seen as simply another form of Collective, and therefore, to adhere to the paradigm established above. In this case, the plays establish an opposition between the happiness, freedom, security, peace and fulfilment of the individual, and a participation in relationships in whatever form.

The family especially becomes a symbol of entrapment in Ibsen.

Bernick, regardless of his son's adult ambitions and desires, determines while he is a boy that Olaf is to succeed him as the head of Bernick and Co. Believing his son to be missing, Bernick asserts "I have my life's work to pass on. It doesn't suit my book at all to be left childless" (page 79), and later, "it's my son I'm working for. It's him I'm making a career for" (page 111).

Nora comes to recognize the extent to which she has been controlled, first by her father and then her husband:

> Daddy used to tell me what he thought,
> then I thought the same...if I thought
> differently I kept quiet about it,
> because he wouldn't have liked it. (page 280)

Torvald perceives his wife as both a pet and a possession.[8] Nora understands that the pattern is self-perpetuating as she tells Torvald:

> I have been your doll wife, just as
> as home I was Daddy's doll child.
> And the children in turn have
> become my dolls. (page 281)

In An Enemy of the People it is a brother who attempts to exercise control, as Peter confesses to Thomas:

> It was always my hope that by
> helping to improve your position
> economically, I might be able to
> some extent to hold you in
> check. (page 56)

Kroll's familial ideal is for all the power to reside with himself. He refers to his own home in affectionate terms as having been a place "where obedience and order have always reigned, where up till now there has only been the one united purpose" (page 301).

Familial control need not be blatant in Ibsen, but is often masked in the form of such ideals as duty, loyalty and fidelity.

In Ghosts, duty is exposed as a means to overrule the wishes of the individual. Manders attempts to persuade Regine to return to Engstrand by referring to "a daughter's duty" (page 357). The Pastor reprimands Mrs. Alving's separation from her husband and son in similar terms, "just as you once denied your duty as a wife you have since denied it as a mother" (page 372).

Nora's sense of fidelity to her husband appears as the reason for her steadfastness given the mutual attraction of Nora and Rank. Matrimonial love seems to be a rope around her freedom, as Nora refers to "those people you love and those people you'd almost rather *be* with" (page 250).

Consideration for one's family, activated as a means of coercion, occurs repeatedly throughout Ibsen.
In attempting to dissuade Nora from leaving, Torvald exclaims "you are betraying your most sacred duty"..."your duty to your husband and your children" (page 382).
Attempting to dissuade the Doctor from making public his allegations, the Mayor instructs him to think of the consequences, "for you and your family" (page 56).
Hovstad, in turn, attempts to shame the Doctor publicly, asserting "his consideration for his wife and children he has abandoned" (page 92).
Kroll attempts to persuade Rosmer to undertake the editorship of his paper by referring to Rosmer's illustrious family heritage, "The foremost family in the district with its seat here now for nearly two hundred years" (page 305).

Heredity is established as another form of entrapment.

Torvald uses the argument repeatedly to convince Nora of her own worthlessness, and consequently the fealty which she owes a 'superior' person such as himself. Discovering Krogstad's letter, Torvald explodes in anger "All your father's irresponsible ways are coming out in you. No religion, no morals, no sense of duty" (page 274).

Both Rank and Oswald are revealed to have inherited debilitating diseases from their father. It is also likely that Mrs. Alving and Regine have been unwittingly blighted in the same sense.

The importance of heredity as a determinant for the behaviour of Hedda is suggested in the masculinity of her physiognymy: "Her face and figure are aristocratic and elegant...Her eyes are steel grey; and cold, clear and dispassionate" (page 179). The prominence of Hedda's father in her life is further suggested in the positioning of his portrait above the sofa upon which she kills herself. Hedda's attachment to the pistols which belonged to her father is a further link between the past and the present, as is popular reference to her still as being Hedda Gabler.

Characters are presented entrapped as a consequence of the stigmatization of another family member. Betty Bernick's anguish at the return of her relatives from the United States is manifested in her tears of shame "I didn't ask them to come home," she cries (page 51).

Familial associations are often presented as the cause of individual and even Collective unhappiness. Collective misery is true for the Alving, Werle and Rosmer family units in particular.[9]

Non-familial relationships are presented as being similarly malign in Ibsen. Such relationships tend to consist of victim and victor/s, although the roles may alternate over a period of time. As the motivation for the establishment of such relationships tends to be mercenary, exploitation and victimization generally result. Inter-personal relationships in Ibsen in whatever form are ultimately unsatisfactory and therefore unattractive. Divergence, because it releases the Individual from the Collective, can be seen as a necessary requisite to freedom, happiness and fulfilment for an Ibsen character.[10]

In contrast to the Ibsen plays, the representatives of the Collectives in Pinero are presented as competent, well-meaning and likeable; persons who embody the beneficial uses of the institutions which they serve.

Bullamy, a police magistrate, is established in the first scene of The Magistrate as existing between the stage and the audience: evident in the frequency of his asides; his unfamiliarity with the Posket family; and, his surprise, and horror, at the antics of Cis, which are likely to match the reactions of the audience. Bullamy appears in the play as a loyal friend, and subsequently, as a surrogate husband and brother-in-law. Using his knowledge of the law, and assuming the role of deliverer, Bullamy gains the release of Agatha and Charlotte, earning himself the praise of family and friends.

Posket, the magistrate, is both humanized and personalized, as he simultaneously appears as magistrate, husband, father, friend and employer. He is also loving, philanthropic, unacquisitive and forgiving.[11]

Hugh Murray, a partner in a law firm, is also a young man in love. That he is honourable is evident in his inability to condone the behaviour of a professional divorcee; and, as he challenges the guardian of a woman about to marry for giving her in marriage to a profligate. Hugh's kindness is recognized by the young Leslie, as she considers him her surrogate mother (page 21). His self-lessness is highlighted as he stands aside, allowing Leslie, whom he loves, to marry another. Hugh also agrees to help Leslie's husband atone for his former wrongdoings.
In the final Act Hugh is shown to be impartial: having given sanctuary to Leslie and her brother in their flight from Dunstan; and also welcoming Dunstan as his friend. Selflessly, Hugh stresses in an aside, "if I can reconcile them it is my duty" (page 96).

Unlike the representatives of organized religion in Ibsen, the Reverend Brice, Dormer and Jedd practise in their own lives the Christian ideals they professionally espouse.
In his first entrance, the Reverend Dormer appeals to the Squire to provide a basket of food for a sick woman in the area. Dormer's concern for the welfare of Kate leads him to caution her about Eric (page 26), as does his night-time trek to inform her that Eric is already married (page 51). A paternal figure, the Reverend adds, "if it had pleased heaven to give me a daughter...to that daughter I should have spoken as I speak to you now" (page 50). When approached by a poor farmhand, the Reverend listens patiently to the old man's problems, before conferring with him (page 30). Fusing Christian teaching and

humanitarian feeling, Dormer reacts to Kate's unwitting relationship with a married man by asserting that the relationship is to end, while promising that he will not expose her folly. Accepting that he has erred, the Reverend is able to forgive Kate (page 81), and to preach a message of tolerance, loyalty and love, to the townspeople assembled (page 80).

The Very Reverend Augustin Jedd promises one thousand pounds of his own money for the restoration of the Church spire. Learning of his sister's widowhood and bankruptcy, Jedd entreats her to live with his family. A former servant of the Reverend's demonstrates a willingness to jeopardise her marriage and to risk arrest in her determination to aid her previous employer in his time of need.

Doctor Delaney establishes the medical profession as one of service, in his willingness to place people before profit, asserting:

> Some of us so-called fashionable
> physicians have made so much money
> out of those who haven't anything
> the matter with them that its hard
> if we can't do a little for the
> benefit of those who have. (page 17)

Wedderburn, the founder of a Bank, is noticeably alienated from the world of finance in the play, instead being humanized as father and friend. The strength of his love for the orphan child Clement is evident in his assertion, "the only time you've really hurt me was when you had the fever years ago" (page 111).

The Right Hon. Sir Julian Twombley, MP, is established as loving and honest, in contrast with the character of political representatives in Ibsen.

A wealthy man, Twombley, married an impoverished woman, for love. His love for his daughter is evident in a scene in which she sits on his lap with her arm around his neck (page 20). An unacquisitive man, Twombley instructs his wife to return to a moneylender her IOU's, aware that it will mean their bankruptcy. As he tells her, "we must hope for a cottage and a small garden where we can grow our own vegetables and learn wisdom" (page 154).

The Resolution to a Pinero play involves the establishment of order, security and happiness for the characters, and the removal of all crises, actual or potential.

The Collective in Pinero is presented as responsible for facilitating and cementing the Resolution.

The multiple crises reach a pitch in In Chancery only to be dispelled with the timely intervention of Scotland Yard.

As Mrs. Jackson rejects her husband's claim to have been absent for six months due to amnesia, Hinxman arrives mistakenly asserting that Jackson is Joliffe, and therefore honour-bound to marry Pat. Pat's father enters ready to shoot 'Joliffe' for having abandoned his daughter. It is at this point that a letter arrives from Police Headquarters establishing that Jackson is not in fact Joliffe (page 69). Jackson is consequently forgiven by both his wife and Pat's father, while Pat becomes engaged to Doctor Titus. In the subplot, a legal decision also facilitates convergence. As John is about to be exposed as the real Joliffe, and therefore arrested and imprisoned for marrying a ward of the Court, his wife's trustees withdraw all legal action against him (page 71).

The central crisis between husband and wife in The Hobby Horse developed from a disagreement over how an empty farmhouse on the estate was to be used. The husband won, to the chagrin of his wife, and developed a home for 'decayed jockeys'. It is the Reverend Noel Brice who exposes the dishonesty of the residents leading to their eviction (page 165).
With the farm house empty once more, husband and wife are able to reach agreement; incorporating the domestic union of the extended family, as their son and his wife are to be the new inhabitants.

In Sweet Lavender it is the family doctor who prepares the way for the final Resolution, covertly arranging for Ruth Holt to attend Wedderburn in his illness, anticipating their relationship of eighteen years previously to be recalled and subsequently reaffirmed. As a consequence, Lavender is recognized by Wedderburn as his daughter, and whom he agrees shall be allowed to marry his adopted son. The marriage of Ruth and Wedderburn appears likely also.

The permanent separation of Kate and her husband Eric appears certain, given the revelation that his first wife is still alive. Reverend Dormer comes to their rescue, as it is he who announces Mathilde's death. Not only is the union of Kate and Eric legal once more, but the Squire's child will have both a father and a mother.
The Church, in the person of the Reverend, then cements simultaneously the relationship of the couple and the Resolution to the play, as he proceeds to bless Kate, who had earlier appeared to have sinned: *'As the curtain falls,*

KATE kneels, DORMER puts his hand on her head' (page 81).

Collective principles are further upheld in the union of Collectives, in the persons of their representatives at the end of the plays. In The Squire, Church, Squirey, Army and State are united, as the Reverend blesses the Squire and her soldier husband, announced as being in the service of his Queen. At the conclusion to Dandy Dick, the Church, the Army and the Law are in harmony, as the local constable accepts the innocence of the Dean, who gives his permission for each of his daughters to marry an Army officer.

The right of the Collective to determine the norms of behaviour and belief is upheld in Pinero. Rather than presenting the establishment of norms for female behaviour as repressive, as does Ibsen, Pinero asserts in his plays that happiness and fulfilment for a woman is to be found within the socially determined bounds of the domestic sphere.

In The Squire, the fact that the Squire is a woman is downplayed, except in the surprise of her first entrance (page 12) as her experiences as such remain peripheral to the action. Instead, the play focuses upon the relationship between Kate and her husband Eric. This is shown to be more important for Kate, as the play ends with the announcement that she is to leave the estate to follow her husband.

The aim of the Union of Independent Women is "to share in the privileges and penalties of the other sex" (page 11) is ridiculed in a play aptly entitled, given Pinero's attitude, The Weaker Sex.

The movement is made the brunt of humour within the play, as Dudley Silchester interprets the announcement of "a monster meeting" as "a meeting of monsters?" (page 7). The women's primary supporter, an MP called Bargus is presented as a figure of fun: young, naive and obtuse. Rhoda is shown to be unhappy as a consequence of her mother's association with the cause. She admits to being jealous of the Gibson girls because "They lead girl's lives," (page 26), and is also shown to be embarrassed at the 'masculinity' and simplicity of her dress at a Ball (page 78). Lady Vivash admits to being involved with the movement simply in order to provide herself with a diversion, enabling her to forget a former lover. Reunited with her daughter she dismisses an important meeting, asserting "I can't think of anything but Sylvia" (page 37). Learning that her former lover is to return, Lady Vivash abandons another important meeting in favour of her dressmaker.

True happiness for a woman is presented as conditional upon love and marriage. The apparent feminism of Mrs. Boyle-Chewton, who is initially described with "her hair worn straight and short...(her) costume severe, dowdy and ungainly," (page 3), is exposed as superficial when she mistakenly believes herself to be engaged to Bargus. Reminded of a meeting she gaily announces, "I don't feel very much inclined to work today," (page 119) before adding "bother the finance committee" (page 120). She coyly announces the engagement to family and friends only to burst into tears when she learns that she was mistaken (page 130). Appearing to have gained wisdom from her

suffering, Pinero has her assert of women "with all our struggles for equality, we are so weak, so incomplete" (page 131).

A clearly defined moral code can be seen to be operating in the Pinero plays. It is a further affirmation of the Collective that illicit, covert and secretive behaviour in themselves transgress this code. The failure to be open and honest is shown to necessarily result in crises, and consequently the misery and unhappiness of the transgressor.[12] This is reiterated throughout Pinero, and is especially true for inter-sexual relationships.

Kate and Eric are married in secrecy, and once married choose to maintain the secrecy of their relationship. The play stresses that they are lawfully wed, so that it is the covert nature of their union which appears punished, as this union is shown to be threatened with the consequences of their deception. The frequency of Eric's visits to Kate initially makes Kate the subject of local gossip and innuendo, and subsequently earns her the antipathy of the local Pastor, and the loss of her friend, Gilbert. The exposure to Kate of Eric's first marriage which he had kept secret, alienates Kate from Eric to the extent that they prepare to separate. Finally, Kate's own servants, learning of Eric's nocturnal visits, threaten her with blackmail. The play demonstrates that only openness and honesty, an acknowledgement of the Collective, can re-establish and reaffirm their relationship - as the Reverend reveals the death of Eric's first wife, and then rallies the local community behind the union of Kate and Eric.

The fact that Pinero chooses to alienate Kate and Eric from the world of the play at the end[13] suggests that they have yet to fully atone for their transgression.

In The Schoolmistress, it is the covert which is again presented as an offence for which the transgressors are made to suffer.

As well as deceiving others by keeping their marriage secret, Miss Dyott and Queckett are shown deceiving each other as well: Caroline, in fact playing a leading role in a comic opera allows her husband to believe she is visiting a sick friend in the country; Vere in her absence and without her knowledge presents her school as being his bachelor establishment, and invites his friends for a party.

At this party, Vere's original lies concerning the relationship of the pupils to himself, for example, are shown to develop independently of his control, a process which he is powerless to resist.

Proportional to the development of their mutual lies, is shown to be the intensification of dissent between the pair, as their initial bickering develops into abuse, each of the other.

The play demonstrates that it is only with openness and honesty, the acknowledgement of their relationship to the society of family and friends, that the pair can begin to be reconciled. As the result of this, their marriage appears stronger than ever before.

Agatha's lie to her husband concerning the age of her son, together with Posket allowing her to believe he is at home when he is actually with Cis, is shown to result in the near collapse of their marriage.

The pair are punished in the sense that the crisis for their marriage is shown to emerge out of their deception. The open acknowledgement of the Truth in front of friends and relatives is shown to result in the mutual reaffirmation of their union.

The advocacy of Collective principles in Pinero can also be seen in the affirmation of the Class system: Pinero presents Society as an harmonious unit, in which patronage is complemented by service, as a consequence of which the security and welfare of all involved is guaranteed. From above is proffered charity philanthropy and concern, in return for which is pledged service, loyalty and respect. The plays demonstrate an almost total acceptance on the part of the characters for their role, as determined within the Collective.[14]

As the Collective in Pinero is synonymous with order, harmony, security and happiness, the Individual and Individuality are associated with alienation, misfortune, disorder and unhappiness.
Individuality in Pinero can be either wilful or enforced. Wilful Individuality can be either malign or benign.

Malign Individuality is a disintegrative force, as the Individual tends to be antagonistic toward the hero, or heroine, intending to upset their position and happiness, and therefore their security. The character traits of such an Individual are contrary to the ideals established in the plays, and include greed, selfishness and indolence. The character of Izod establishes him as a wilfully malign Individual in The Squire, as he is *'dirty and disreputable, an idler and a sneak'* (page 6). He is not integrated into

the work unit of the village, preferring to take money from his hard-working sister. As well, Izod is disliked within the world of the play, most importantly by the saintly characters Gilbert and Kate, even before he steals the ale meant for the Harvest Festival, appears drunk and then blames another. Izod is Divergence personified as he tampers with the established relationship between Kate and Eric as a means to exact revenge for the Squire's dislike of him. Izod is gleeful after finding keys which establish Eric as a covert visitor to Kate's house (page 7), and ruthless in his threatened exposure of her in the town.

Izod's behaviour is punished in the form of his stigmatization by the local Pastor before the assembled villagers (page 80). Given the degree of local regard for the Squire, Izod's eventual assimilation into the Collective is unlikely. Izod's alienated position appears unattractive in the play, as love and kindliness are shown concentrated in the local community.

Joseph Lebanon is shown to be unintegrated socially, as a working class person dissatisfied with his life, who seeks to relocate himself at the level of the gentry. He is ruthless in his quest: emerging initially as a money-lender and subsequently as a blackmailer - his victim, the endearing Lady Twombley. Like Izod, Joseph is associated with Divergence, as Kate Twombley is obliged to keep his actions secret from her husband for the sake of her marriage. As she is discovered by her husband attempting to steal confidential documents on Lebanon's behalf, the permanent Divergence of the married pair

seems inevitable (page 154).

As with Izod, Joseph is alienated in the world of the play due to the antipathy of the other characters for him, as they collectively ignore his reiterated attempts at conversation. Similarly also, Joseph is punished at the end of the play, as his treachery wins him only financial ruin.

In contrast, a benign Individual is one whose behaviour and belief are merely unconventional. Such persons include a woman active in a traditionally male sphere, and a man who adheres to a way of life which is contrary to the norms of his class. Such Individuality is willingly renounced when confronted with the potential for assimilation, generally occurring in personal terms, in the opportunity for marriage. Valentine White chooses to alienate himself from friends, family and country, in order to escape the 'ceremony' he detests, instead choosing to live in deepest Africa, for example. Upon his return, as well as voicing his hostility for the presentation of Imogen at court, Valentine refuses to conform in the manner of his dress (page 5). Similarly, he chooses to maintain a distance between himself and his relations. When presented to a person to whom he is distantly related, White proclaims "I join you in remembering the relationship, and the distance" (page 10).

Pinero demonstrates that as Valentine is reunited with his childhood sweetheart, the seeming intransigence of his position is quickly undermined. He accepts a position at Drumdurris Castle when he learns that Imogen will be holidaying there. White becomes engaged to Imogen when

her engagement to Colin is broken, but not before he has renounced his Individuality. For his final appearance, White is dressed *'in immaculate evening dress'* (page 181). Georgina Tidman is known also as George Tidd, a woman who with the death of her husband, assumed the position of Breeder of Racehorses. Her style of dress is masculine, complete with *'Billy Cock hat and coaching coat'* (page 29). Her manner is loud and forceful, her gestures aggressive, all of which is atypical for a woman in a Pinero play. And yet, having fallen in love with Sir Tristram, it is as a woman that 'George' chooses to appear. Thanking Sir Tristram for his assistance to her brother, she asserts "They are acts which any true woman would esteem" (page 146). Of her assistance to Mardon she claims, "any lady would do the same" (page 147). Her manner at the close of the play is similarly feminine, as Georgina *'goes to him cordially'* and *'They go together to the fireplace, he with his arm around her waist'* (page 147).

Individuality is also presented as unwanted alienation, or misfortune, as with the Cinderella-type characters in the plays.

Beatie Tomlinson is a young Lady reduced to teaching music as a means of survival (page 5), as she appears to have no mother, her father having been found guilty of theft. Fortuitously, Beatie and Cis fall in love. The announcement of their engagement is a joyous occasion, accompanied by champagne.

Peggy Hesserligge is an orphan, studying to be a governess, and therefore occupies an anomalous position between pupil

and staff. As well, she is poor and therefore *'shabbily dressed'* with the appearance of *'a neglected child'* (page 6). Like Beatie, however, Peggy falls in love with, and soon becomes engaged to, a gentleman.

Bertha is also a young orphan who lives with her uncle, an impoverished Reverend. She too falls in love and becomes engaged to a wealthy gentleman. Bertha is accepted into Allan's family as a surrogate child.

Individuality in whatever form is an unenviable state in Pinero, as it is either punished or willingly renounced. The only acceptable form of individuality is exceptional goodness, as with Kate Verity and Lavender.

As in Ibsen, Inter-personal relations can be seen as simply another form of Collective, so that such relations in Pinero demonstrate the qualities of the Collective in his plays.

Consequently, the family emerges as a receptacle of security, love and peace; and in which the spirit of Collectiveness predominates. Families are shown co-operating to assist members, in solving a problem or averting a crisis. As a source of support, the family promises financial aid and/or co-operation. Inter-sexual relations, so often culminating in marriage or the reaffirmation of an existing union, share these qualities also. Friendship and Inter-Class Relationships further mirror the paradigm established for familial relations: friendship in Pinero is both lasting and genuine; Inter-class Relations are established as either surrogate-familial, or friendship-style relationships.

CONCLUSION

Inter-personal Relationships in the plays of Ibsen and Pinero are not arbitrary, but follow a clearly defined pattern. Divergence predominates in Ibsen, while Convergence is paramount in Pinero.

Divergence appears in the weakening or even disavowal of existing relationships and the inhibiting of new relations; the static alienation of an unintegrated character; and, the atmosphere of deception, mistrust and secrecy, found in Ibsen.

Convergence is demonstrated in the establishment of new Inter-personal relations and the strengthening or reaffirmation of those already existing; and, the spirit of Convergence evident in such Inter-personal tendencies as co-operation, philanthropy and forgiveness.

The family in Ibsen is presented as an uneasy alliance of diverse peoples with conflicting beliefs and intentions. Familial relationships are dominated by jealousy, rivalry, mistrust and deception. An inability or unwillingness to confer and confide is a recurring feature of marriage in Ibsen, as is infidelity, actual or desired; an absence of Love; and even, the psychological torment of one partner by the other. Courtship relations in Ibsen demonstrate such features in embryo.

Friendship is a transitory relationship in Ibsen, where friends become enemies due to a misunderstanding, or, as is more usual, the impulse to jealousy, rivalry and

antagonism latent within such relationships.
Inter-class Convergence does not exist, nor is it seriously mooted in the plays, as class ideology, loyalty and allegiance, as well as pride and self-interest appear in Ibsen as fundamental barriers to Convergence.
The motivation for the establishment of Inter-sexual, Friendship and Inter-class relationships in Ibsen is generally revealed as being mercenary.

The family in Pinero emerges as a source of security, love and peace. The Convergence of familial relationships takes place with the reconciliation of family members previously estranged, the integration of orphans and widows, the illegitimate and the unmarried, as well as the formation of surrogate relations.
Inter-sexual Convergence is evident in the essential invulnerability of existing relationships, and the establishment of new relations upon strong foundations.
Friendship in Pinero is also both genuine and long-lasting. Affection, loyalty and concern are presented as emotions which are able to transcend traditional class lines, in Pinero, producing Convergence.

An examination of Inter-personal Relationships in the plays of Ibsen and Pinero soon reveals that both Convergence and Divergence relate to a particular ideal for life and for living.
Divergence in Ibsen makes a positive and not a negative statement. The Ideal in the plays is not to be found in a struggle for Inter-personal Convergence, but with the spirit of anti-Convergence. Divergence in Ibsen is not synonymous with nihilism, but is related to the established

Ideals of Truth and Freedom. To achieve these, the plays demonstrate that it is first necessary to alienate oneself from the Collective, of which Inter-personal Relationships are merely one example. The Collective is shown to foster the compromise of Ideals - the sacrifice of Truth for illusions, pragmatism and the satisfaction of the self-serving principle; and Freedom for conformity. Conversely, in Pinero, it is Love which is established as the Ideal, and Love which is embodied in the Convergence of Inter-personal Relationships. Alienation is an unenviable state in Pinero, associated with either punishment or misfortune. The Pinero plays assert that a society in which Convergence in Inter-personal Relationships is the norm is one in which happiness, security and fulfilment are omnipresent.

The study of Inter-personal Relationships in the drama of Ibsen and Pinero has revealed, as well as a fundamental dichotomy - Convergence versus Divergence, the contrasting Ideals which are central to their plays - Love versus Truth and Freedom. Convergence and Divergence can be seen as symptomatic of the operation of these Ideals in the plays.

The preceding study has also provided an additional vehicle for comparison between Ibsen and those dramatists thought to have been influenced by his work, and Pinero with other English dramatists, as well as a starting point for a thorough comparison of the plays of Ibsen with the English dramatists of the 1880's.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION:

1. Such works that do exist compare Ibsen with the English dramatists of the 1890's, such as Shaw, while Ibsen's most acclaimed work is largely confined to the period 1879-1890.

2. Robert Ronning, "The Eccentric: The English Comic Farce of Sir Arthur Pinero." Quarterly Journal of Speech, 63, 1977, p.52.

3. The other being the Savoy Opera's. Hamilton H. Fyfe, Arthur Wing Pinero: A Study, (London: Greening and Co. Ltd; 1902), p.27.

4. Cecil W. Davies, "Pinero: The Drama of Reputation." English, p.13.

5. For such an interpretation, see Allardyce Nicoll, A History of the English Drama 1600-1900: Vol 5, Late Nineteenth Century Drama (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), p.177.

6. Wilbur Dwight Dunkel, Sir Arthur Pinero: A critical biography with letters (New York: University of Chicago Press, 1941) p.24.

7. Ibid., p.32.

8. The Magistrate was produced in London as recently as 1986.

9. These terms developed naturally from a study of the plays, and therefore independently of any sociological definition of related concepts.

10. During this period, it was the norm for Ibsen to complete one play every two years. Pinero often wrote three to four plays in a single year. J.P. Wearing (ed) The Collected Letters of Sir Arthur Pinero (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1974) p.6.

CHAPTER 1:

1. Dina lives under Bernick's roof due to his sister Martha's charity and not his own, as he confesses to Lona, "it was Martha who worked that" (page 74).

2. Nora's reiterated use of the possessive pronoun, 'my', when referring to her children, is reminiscent of Torvald's manner of speech when referring to his wife (chapter 2).

3. By classifying the contents of the home as belonging to his mother, Oswald places himself in the position of guest or visitor. Ideally, such a home would be seen as being the domain of the family, collectively.

4. Ghosts, pages 377, 392, 393 and 397.

5. Oswald is attracted to Regine because she possesses the "joy of life" (page 402) which he believes his mother does not, "I never feel it here," (page 416), and also because he feels he can rely on Regine to give him "a helping hand" (page 411), when necessary. Oswald resists his mother's attempts to secure this role for herself, "you?...No, mother, you'd never give me that sort of helping hand" (page 412).

6. Until Mrs. Alving's revelation later in the play, Regine appears to believe that Engstrand is her natural father.

7. It is not until later in the play that Hjalmar learns that Hedvig may not be his daughter.

8. Contracted to work in India, Mable, a widow, gave his daughter, Florence, into the temporary care of his brother. After losing all contact with them, much to his distress, Mable has travelled the world tirelessly in search of his only child.

9. "Shall we say we forgive the Rascal all round?" The Rocket, page 79.

10. Dandy Dick, pages 30, 32 and 48.

11. Dandy Dick, pages 46 and 94-5.

12. H. Hamilton Fyfe asserts of this theme of a mother and daughter in love with the same man:
> There is something in the idea so eminently distasteful to the mind of the average healthy person that a play dealing with it starts at a heavy disadvantage.

Arthur Wing Pinero: A Study (London: Greening and Co, 1902), page 55.

CHAPTER 2:

1. In the words of James McFarlane, "There is infatuation in this world, possessiveness, appetite...but one will search in vain for any love scene of genuine proportions." Ibsen and the Temper of Norwegian Literature (London: Oxford University Press, 1960), page 65.

2. Engstrand claims that the three hundred dollars Johanna received from Alving was used exclusively for Regine's education. However, this would not be the first time that he had lied to Manders to save himself.

3. Werle introduced Hjalmar to Gina's mother who had a room to let; Werle provided the money for Hjalmar "to learn photography and set up a studio" (page 136), thereby ensuring the financial basis on which a marriage could be established.

4. Tesman: "Just think Hedda...Ejlert Lovborg isn't going to stand in our way after all!"
Hedda: "[*shortly*] Our Way? Leave me out of it!"

5. That Hedda is unmoved by her husband's distress is evident both prior to Rina's death, as she asserts "I don't want to look at sickness and death" (page 234) and following "well, it was to be expected" (page 239).

6. L. Veszny-Wagner, "Pinero's Farce 'The Magistrate' as an Anxiety Dream."
American Imago, 32, 1975, pp.200-215, asserts that Cis and Bullamy are to be seen as Posket's alter ego's, and therefore, that the play turns upon the question - "Who carries the real identity of the Master: the older dignified man or the young rouge?" (page 205).

7. Johan R. Hendrick "Pinero's Court Farces: A Revaluation" Modern Drama 26, pp.54-61, does not agree that the character of Vere is rehabilitated in the course of the play, instead asserting that at the close, "Voluminia is still saddled with her parasite..." (page 57).

CHAPTER 3:

1. "Who wouldn't have willingly sacrificed himself for you, especially when all it meant was a month's gossip, and then straight afterwards the chance of escaping into the great wide world"(page 63).

2. Bernick continues with his plan to refloat the *Indian Girl* without adequate repairs, even as he learns that the ship is unseaworthy, and further that Johan is to sail on her.

3. "Everyday, along come Hilda and Nette to set me a good example" (page 37).

4. "He thinks he has every right to treat me as an equal with his 'Torvald this' and 'Torvald that' every time he opens his mouth" (page 243).

5. "When we were first married, it even used to make him sort of jealous if I only as much as mentioned any of my old friends" (page 238).

6. Manders continues:
> That's what's so likeable about Jacob Engstrand - the fact that he comes along so helplessly, so full of self reproach, to confess his failings, (page 364).

7. This applies to Tesman's knowledge that Ejlert had obtained a position with the Elvsted's and subsequently, the recent publishing of his new book (page 179).

8. As Clement tells Dick when he makes his unsteady entrance in Act One, "you've broken your word to me again" (page 19).
Dick asserts with reference to Lavender, "for the sake of her peace of mind and your future, pull up before the mischief's done" (page 22).

9. Hamilton H. Fyfe's interpretation is cynical rather than accurate:
> Dick's reformation, like Mr. Wedderburn's remorse comes a little late in the play. These Third Act repentances always leave one in doubt as to how long they will last (page 60).

CHAPTER 4:

1. See chapter 5.

2. Regine reveals to the audience in Act One the extent to which Engstrand is a habitual miser (page 353), while Engstrand stresses to Regine, the sizeable income she can expect with regard to the proposed Home (page 352). As Engstrand continues, "I'd thought of putting my money into something worthwhile" (page 354).

3. As Rebecca tells Kroll; Beata was when she moved into the area "so desperately in need of friendly care and sympathy" (page 297).

4. See chapter 2.

5. Martin Ellehauge, "Initial Stages in the development of the English Problem Play" Englische Studien, CXIV, March 1932, asserts of Inter-class relations in Pinero "the higher and lower classes appear to belong to different worlds and do not mix well" (page 385). Generalizations of this nature, unaccompanied by evidence, abound in this article.

6. See pages 29, 41 and 46.

7. See chapter 3.

8. Having arranged for a particular horse to transport Jedd, Hannah tells the Dean that he need only whistle for the horse to bolt enabling him to make his escape (page 114).

CHAPTER 5:

1. "The intentions of all the characters (in Pinero) are praiseworthy, or at least innocently mistaken, and their actions spring from qualities and motives they share with all humanity."
Edmund J. Milner "The Novelty of Arthur Pinero's Court Farces." English Literature in Transition, 19 (1976), p.303.

2. See chapters 1, 2 and 3.

3. "Torvald's relation to Truth is one of mere expedience and formality." Rolf Fjelde Ibsen: A Collection of Critical Essays. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1965), p.25.

4. "Manders' inability and unwillingness to see and to judge reality except through the eyes of codified moral demands result in a continual distortion of the vital truth."
Ibid., p.26.

5. For a sympathetic interpretation of the character of Manders see: Charles Leland "In defence of Pastor Manders." Modern Drama, 21 (1978) pp.405-419.

6. The Squire, pages 41, 48 and 65.

7. The three small children are under the care of a Nurse.

CHAPTER 6:

1. The terms Collective and Individual are explained in the Introduction.

2. Manders presumes to counsel Mrs. Alving in loyalty and forgiveness; Regine in duty, and Engstrand in honesty.

3. See chapter 5.

4. An Enemy of the People, page 96.

5. "Ibsen's criticism is directed both against abstract demands claiming absolute validity and all codes and social norms making similar claims for conformity."
F.W. Kaufmann "Ibsen's conception of Truth" Ibsen: A Collection of Critical Essays. p.19.

6. This is not to say that altruism is necessarily a liability in Ibsen's world, but rather that it is likely to be unappreciated, even unnoticed.

7. Ejlert believed that his manuscript had been stolen.

8. See chapter 2.

9. See chapter 1.

10. For a nihilistic view of 'Divergence' in Ibsen see: Stephen Wicher "The World of Ibsen" Ibsen: A Collection of Critical Essays, pp.169-174.

11. See chapter 5.

12. "Deception and duplicity are at the heart of every problem confronting the Twombleys." English Literature in Transition, 19 (1976), p.302.

13. Eric's regiment has been posted to India and Kate is going with him.

14. This, as well as the extent to which Inter-class relationships are shown to assume the form of familial and friendship relationships in Pinero is examined in chapter 4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

IBSEN:

Arestad, Sverre. "Peer Gynt and the Idea of the Self." Modern Drama, 12 (1969), 103-122.

Bradbrook, Muriel, C. Ibsen the Norwegian: A Reevaluation. New Ed. Connetticut: Archon Books, 1965.

Crompton, Louis. "The Demonic in Ibsen's Wild Duck." Tulane Drama Review, IV, 96-103.

Dubore, Bernard, F. "Kristine Linde and Gregers Werle." Essays in Theatre, I, (1982), 45-51.

Elsom, John. "Ibsen and the Lost Bohemia." Contemporary Review 243 (1983), 137-142.

Esslin, Martin. Reflections: Essays on Modern Theatre. New York: Doubleday, 1969.

Fjelde, Rolf ed. Ibsen: A Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Gray, Ronald, D. Ibsen: A Dissenting View. Cambridge: CUP, 1977.

Harmer, Ruth. "Character, conflict and meaning in the Wild Duck." Modern Drama, 12 (1969) 419-427.

Hurrel, John. "Rosmersholm, the Existentialist Drama and the Dilemma of Modern Tragedy." Educational Theatre Journal, 15 (1963), 118-124.

Jacobs, B. "Ibsen's Little Eyolf: Family Tragedy and Human Responsibility." Modern Drama, 27 (1984), 604-615.

Kildahl, Erling, E. "Ibsen's Contrasting Clergy." Educational Theatre Journal, 15 (1963), 348-357.

_____ "The Social Conditions and Principles of Hedda Gabler." Educational Theatre Journal, 13 (1961), 207-213.

Leland, Charles. "In defence of Pastor Manders." Modern Drama, 21 (1978) 405-420.

Lepke, Arno, K. "Who is Dr. Stockmann?" Scandanavian Studies, 32 (1976), 57-75.

Lester, Elenore. "Ibsen's unliberated heroines." Scandanavian Review, 66 (1970), 58-66.

Lund, Mary Graham. "The Existentialism of Ibsen." Person, XLI (1974), 310-317.

Marowitz, Charels. "Ibsen, Strindberg and the Sex War." Contemporary Review, 236, (1969), 147-149.

McFarlane, James Walter. Ibsen and the Temper of Norwegian Literature. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Quigley, Austin, E. "A Doll's House Revisited." Modern Drama, 27 (1984), 584-603.

Raphael, Robert "From Hedda Gabler to When We Dead Awaken: The Quest for Self Realization." Scandanavian Studies, 36 (1980), 34-47.

———————— "Illusion and the Self in the Wild Duck, Rosmersholm and The Lady From the Sea." Scandanavian Studies, 35 (1977), 37-50.

Roazen, Deboroah Heller. "The Surrogate Self in Ibsen's Mature Plays." Drama Review, 58 (1968), 346-359.

Rosenberg, Marvin. "Ibsen vs. Ivsen, or Two Versions of A Doll's House." Modern Drama, 12 (1969), 187-96.

Spacks, Patricia Meyer. "Confrontation and Escape in Two Social Dramas." Modern Drama, 11 (1968), 61-72.

Stein, Walter. "No need of this hypothesis: Ghosts and the Death of God." Critical Quarterly, 9 (1974), 109-119.

PINERO:

Archer, William. The Old Drama and the New: An Essay in Revaluation. Boston: Small and Maynard, 1923.

Freedman, Morris ed. Essays in the Modern Drama. Boston: Heath, 1964.

Armstrong, Cecil Ferard. Shakespeare to Shaw. London: Mills and Boon, 1913.

Boas, F.S. From Richardson to Pinero. London: J. Murry, 1936.

Clark, Barret, H. The British and American Drama of Today. Cincinnatti: Steward and Kidd, 1921.

Collins, J.P. "The Plays of Arthur Wing Pinero." Quarterly Review, 254 (1930), 292-310.

Cook, Dutton. "The Case of Mr. Pinero." The Theatre, 5 (1882) 202-4.

Davies, Cecil, W. "Pinero: The Drama of Reputation." English, 14 (1962) 13-17.

Dickinson, Thomas, H. The Conteporary Drama of England. Boston: Houghton Miffin, 1917.

Donohue, Joseph. "Character, Genre and Ethos in Nineteenth Century British Drama." Yes, 9 (79), 78-101.

Ellehauge, Martin. "Initial Stages in the Development of the English Problem Play." Englische Studien, 64 (1932), 126-142.

Elsom, John. Erotic Theatre. New York: Taplinger, 1974.

England, Denzil. "Pinero: A Centenary." Contemporary Review, 187 (1955) 313-318.

Frohman, Daniel. Encore. New York: Lee Furman, 1937.

Fyfe, Henry Hamilton. Arthur Wing Pinero: Playwright. London: Greening, 1902.

———————— Sir Arthur Wing Pinero's Plays and Players. New York: MacMillan, 1930.

Hendrickz, Johan, R. "Pinero's Court Farces: A Revaluation." Modern Drama, 26 (1983), 54-61.

Lazenby, Walter. Arthur Wing Pinero. New York: Twayne, 1972.

Marriot, J.W. Modern Drama. New York: Thomas Nelson, 1949.

Miner, Edmund, J. "The Novelty of Arthur Wing Pinero's Court Farces." English Literature in Transition, 19 (1976), 299-305.

Morgan, A.E. Tendencies of Modern English Drama. New York: Scribners, 1924.

Nicoll, Allardyce. British Drama: An Historical Survey from the Beginnings to the Present Time. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1945.

———————— A History of the English Drama, 1600-1900: Vol.5, Nineteenth Century Drama. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Ronning, Robert. "The Eccentric: The English Comic Farce of St. Arthur Pinero." Quarterly Journal of Speech, 63 (1977), 51-58.

Sharp, R.F. "Arthur Wing Pinero and Farce." The Theatre, 20 (1892) 154-7.

———————— "Mr. Pinero and Literary Drama." The Theatre, 22 (1893) 3-8.

Simon, Elliot, M. The Problem Play in British Drama, 1890-1914. Salzburg: University of Salzburg, 1978.

Veszy-Wagner, L. "Pinero's Farce 'The Magistrate' as an Anxiety Dream." Amer Imago, 32 (1975) 200-215.

Wearing, J.P. ed. The Collected Letters of Arthur Wing Pinero. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 1974.